

**Negative**

## **Biodiversity DA**

## Biodiversity DA -- 1nc

### **Climate change places unique stress on marine biodiversity -- only reducing non-climate stressors can prevent total marine ecosystem collapse**

#### **Marine Technical Team 11**

(Marine Technical Team of national, government-wide strategy to safeguard fish, wildlife, plants, and the natural systems upon which they depend, February 4<sup>th</sup>, 2011, "Marine Ecosystems", [http://www.wildlifeadaptationstrategy.gov/pdf/Marine\\_Ecosystems\\_Paper.pdf](http://www.wildlifeadaptationstrategy.gov/pdf/Marine_Ecosystems_Paper.pdf))

These **physical and chemical changes in the marine environment will directly impact the biological functions of the species occupying these systems**. Thus, **as changes occur** in ocean temperature or pH, **one can expect changes in nutrient availability, biological productivity, reproductive success, the timing of biological processes** (e.g., spawning), **biogeography, migrations, community structure, predator-prey relationships, and entire biomes**. For example: Temperature changes in marine ecosystems will affect ecological processes such as productivity, species interactions, and even toxicity of compounds found in marine systems (Schiedek et al. 2007). Species are adapted to specific ranges of environmental temperatures. As temperatures change, species can respond by: 1) migrating poleward or deeper; 2) reducing their climate niche within the existing range; 3) evolve; or 4) go extinct (Mueter and Litzow 2008, Cheung et al. 2009, Nye et al. 2009, Overholtz et al. 2011), creating new combinations of species that will interact in unpredictable ways. Changes in ocean circulation patterns will change larval dispersal patterns and the geographic distributions of marine species (Block et al. 2011). Between 2000 and 2100, warming in the North Pacific is projected to result in a 30 percent increase in the area of the subtropical biome, while areas of the equatorial upwelling and temperate biomes will decrease by 28 percent and 34 percent, respectively (Polovina et al. 2010). Altered patterns of wind and water circulation in the ocean environment will influence the vertical movement of ocean waters (i.e., upwelling and downwelling). This coupled with increased stratification of the water column resulting from changes in salinity and water temperature will change the availability of essential nutrients and oxygen to marine organisms throughout the water column. Warming of both air and ocean temperatures has resulted in the loss of Arctic sea ice. Retreat of sea ice has resulted in the loss of habitat for marine mammals such as ice seals and polar bears (*Ursus maritimus*) which are adapted to live on or engage in some activities on the ice. Variation in the spatial extent of sea ice and timing of the spring retreat has strong effects on the productivity of the Bering Sea ecosystem. For example, the timing of the spring phytoplankton bloom is directly tied to the location of the sea ice edge over the Bering Sea shelf (Stabeno et al 2001). Increased ocean acidification will directly and indirectly impact physiological and biological processes of marine organisms such as growth, development, and reproduction (Le Quesne and Pinnegar 2011). **Species can respond to gradual changes in the climate over long time scales** of years to decades to centuries **and adapt biologically to new conditions**. **A primary concern** for fish, wildlife, and plants and their ecosystems **is the rapid rate of change currently observed** and the fundamental changes in mean ecosystem state to which these organisms have adapted. **While many species can respond to changing conditions over long time frames** (decades or longer) **the current rate of change is likely too fast** for many species to respond to and biologically adapt. Regional changes are more relevant to understanding ecological responses to climate change than are global averages (Walther et al. 2002). Impacts of climate change should therefore not only be studied on ocean basin scales, but also at regional and local scales by downscaling global climate models (Stock et al. 2010) complimented with empirical observation, monitoring, and experiments. Impacts of Non-Climate Stressors: **The impacts of climate change on species can be made worse when combined with the impacts of non-climate stressors**. The National Center for Ecological Analysis and Synthesis has mapped<sup>2</sup> and published (Halpern et al. 2008) stressors resulting from human activities on marine ecosystems worldwide. **Major non-climate stressors include habitat loss or modification**, anthropogenic noise, harmful algal blooms,<sup>3</sup> fishing (Hilborn et al. 2003, Pauly et al. 2005, Mora et al. 2009, Worm et al. 2009, Murawski 2010, Branch et al. In Press); agricultural, industrial, and household **activities producing** nutrient and **contaminant enrichment and introduce debris in coastal waters** (Carpenter et al. 1998, Cloern 2001, Anderson et al. 2002); energy/mineral exploration and extraction (Paine et al. 1996); **and** a variety of **marine hazards related to human activities** (e.g. Crain et al. 2008). **Stresses from these sources have the potential to exacerbate the effect of climate change**. Alternatively, **reducing the impacts of these stressors** (in association with climate change) **presents a management opportunity to moderate the effect of climate change on marine systems and species**, while efforts continue to reduce green house gas emissions.

## **Port dredging ensures massive habitat loss, contaminant spread, and water quality destruction -- drift ensures contamination is dispersed far beyond initial sources of dredging**

**Je et al 7**

(Chung-hwan, Department of Environmental Health and Safety, University of Nevada, Reno, Additional Authors: Donald F. Hayes, Kyung-sub Kim, "Simulation of resuspended sediments resulting from dredging operations by a numerical flocculent transport model", *Chemosphere*, 70 (2007) 187–195)

**Sediment contamination is of great environmental concern** in lakes or rivers **because of its potential toxic effects on biological and ecological resources** and on human health. A large variety of contaminants, including PCBs, dioxin, pesticides, heavy metals, PAHs and other pollutants from industrial, agricultural, urban, and maritime activities are associated with sediment particulates, including bottom sediments (Gebler, 2000, Geffard et al., 2001 and Riley, 2005). **Environmental remediations, even for dredging operations, cause contaminated sediments from the bottom of water bodies to become suspended into the water column. These resuspended particles pose significant water quality concerns and cause adverse effects to aquatic organisms.** Furthermore, these fine sediment suspensions affect the transport of organic and inorganic contaminants including nutrients and toxics (Riley, 2005). The authors are specifically interested in water quality impacts resulting from environmental dredging of bottom sediments with substantial contaminants concentrations associated with the particles. These **dredging actions are usually considered to be one-time operations** requiring predictions of water quality impacts resulting from sediments resuspended during the process and the potential for toxic contaminant transport. **Concerns about these operations usually include biological and ecological impacts in the immediate vicinity of the dredging operations and the potential for contaminant spread into previously unaffected areas.** In this paper, we present a vertically integrated two-dimensional flocculent sediment transport model to better model concentration changes of resuspended bottom sediments. These **contaminated fine particles** remaining in suspension typically have low settling velocities and **can remain in suspension for extended periods of time.** Consequently, **they may be transported significant distances away from the initial action.** Toxic chemicals that can impair water quality are most often associated with these fine sediment particles and transported along with the sediment particles. The mechanics of suspended sediment transport modeling have been well developed and described in numerous literatures (O'Connor et al., 1983, Thomann et al., 1993, Wheater et al., 1993, Haan et al., 1994, Velleux and Endicott, 1994, Chapra, 1997, Prosser and Rustumji, 2000, Ziegler et al., 2000, Parsons et al., 2001, Merritt et al., 2003 and Büttner et al., 2006). The general suspended sediment transport equation is  $\frac{dc}{dt} + u \frac{dc}{dx} = E \frac{d^2c}{dx^2} - vs \frac{dc}{dx}$  where  $c$  = suspended solids concentration (mg m<sup>-3</sup>),  $t$  = elapsed time (s),  $W(t)$  = rate at which suspended sediment is being introduced into the water column (mg s<sup>-1</sup> m<sup>-3</sup>),  $u$  = current velocity (m s<sup>-1</sup>),  $E$  = directional turbulent diffusion coefficient (m<sup>2</sup> s<sup>-1</sup>),  $vs$  = settling velocity of sediment particles (m s<sup>-1</sup>), and  $H$  = water depth (m). In most applications, the settling velocity is taken as a constant either estimated from Stokes' law or determined through calibration with available field data; Kuo and Welch (1985) and Kuo and Hayes (1991) are examples of this approach using Stokes' law. However, Je and Hayes (2004) have showed that Stokes' law significantly underestimates settling velocities for these fine suspensions. In situ calibration of the settling velocities is an alternative for ongoing actions, but impractical for one-time operations that require an a priori estimate of the magnitude and extent of water quality impacts.

## **US marine ecosystems are key to starfish -- they're a keystone species and on the brink now -- die-off spills over to the Caribbean, ensures massive biodiversity loss and extinction**

**Brown 14**

(Desmond, Inter Press Service, Quotes John Mussington -- Marine Biologist, "Caribbean Fears Loss of "Keystone Species" to Climate Change", Apr 26 2014, <http://www.ipsnews.net/2014/04/caribbean-fears-loss-keystone-species-climate-change/>)

A marine biologist has cautioned that the **mass deaths of starfish along the United States west coast in recent months could also occur in the Caribbean** region because of climate change, threatening the vital fishing sector. Since June 2013, scientists began noticing that starfish, which they say function as keystone species in the marine ecosystem, have been mysteriously dying by the millions. **"The cause of the starfish die-off** which is taking place in the Pacific Ocean is not known at this time but it **could turn out to be from a number of factors including climate change,"** John

Mussington told IPS. “If it turns out that climate change factors such as ocean warming are indeed implicated in the starfish die-off, then there is the possibility that **the same thing could happen in the Atlantic and affect Caribbean species**.” “We are living in an era when the predicted consequences of climate change are now reality. Large scale die-off of can therefore happen to us in the Caribbean,” Mussington added **Starfish play a key role in marine ecosystems**. They eat mussels, barnacles, snails, mollusks and other smaller sea life so **their health is considered a measure of marine life on the whole** in a given area. **Starfish are in turn eaten by** shorebirds, gulls, and sometimes **sea otters**. Mussington explained that something similar to what’s happening in California has happened in the region before. He told IPS that in 1983 there was a Caribbean-wide die-off of the black sea urchin, spreading from as far north as The Bahamas right down the chain of islands to the south. “The long-spined sea urchin was a keystone species in the Caribbean marine ecosystem, similar to the affected starfish in the Pacific-California ecosystem. **The designation as ‘keystone’ is due to the fact that if there is anything affecting their large populations, then this can be interpreted as a reliable indication of problems in the entire ecosystem** that will likely affect other species,” Mussington said. “Something went very wrong with our Caribbean marine ecosystem in 1983 and the black sea urchin was wiped out – the species is considered today to be functionally extinct. With the decline of this keystone species, the Caribbean has seen significant decline in its coral reefs and the marine communities they support, including economically important commercial species.” Mussington said the spiny urchin grazes on algae and it is important to control the number of algae on coral reefs. Habitat degradation, specifically of coral reefs, has been cited by numerous studies as the primary cause of ongoing fish declines of Caribbean fish populations Caribbean coral reefs have experienced drastic losses in the past several decades. Fish use the structure of corals for shelter and they also contribute to coastal protection. Established research has predicted that the communities located in coastal areas, as well as national economies in the general Caribbean region, are likely to sustain substantial economic losses should the current trends in coral reef degradation and destruction continue. It has been estimated that fisheries associated with coral reef in the Caribbean region are responsible for generating net annual revenues, which have been valued at or above approximately 837 million Eastern Caribbean dollars, or about 310 million U.S. dollars. Continued degradation of the region’s few remaining coral reefs would diminish these net annual revenues by an estimated 95-140 million U.S. dollars annually by 2015. The subsequent decrease in dive tourism could also profoundly affect annual net tourism revenues “There has to be some balance and **once you have a major species dying off, it’s going to have repercussions for the entire system**. We must not forget that man is a integral part of this system and **the repercussions for us will be serious**,” Mussington told IPS. The fisheries sector in the CARICOM Region is an important source of livelihoods and sustenance. The local population is highly dependent on this resource for economic and social development. This resource also contributes significantly to food security, poverty alleviation, employment, foreign exchange earnings, development and stability of rural and coastal communities, culture, recreation and tourism. The subsector provides direct employment for more than 120,000 fishers and indirect employment opportunities for thousands of others – particularly women – in processing, marketing, boat-building, net-making and other support services. But the coordinator for the United Nations Environment Programme’s Caribbean Regional Coordinating Unit-Caribbean Environment Programme, Nelson Andrade Colmenares, told IPS the vital sector is being threatened by climate change. “**The Caribbean Sea, home to a vibrant ecosystem benefitting fisherfolk, the tourism industry and the region’s people alike is currently threatened**,” he said, adding that “over harvesting of fisheries, climate change and pollution from sewage, agricultural runoff and industrial effluent has led to 75 percent of coral reefs in the region being labeled as at risk.” Acting permanent secretary in Dominica’s fisheries ministry, Harold Guiste agrees, explaining that the future of the Caribbean’s conch and lobster fisheries remains under threat despite regional efforts to protect it. Guiste blames the problem of overfishing squarely on nations outside the Caribbean that trawl the region’s seas illegally. “Globally we have noticed a rush to fish accompanied by a lack of responsible behaviour in the fishing sector,” he told IPS. “This type of hooligan behaviour has resulted in severe decline in some major fisheries of the world and collapse in some others.” The Dominican official called for a collaborative approach to safeguard against the depletion of the region’s already challenged resources. The spiny lobster trade brings in about 456 million US dollars to CARICOM nations but demand has led to overfishing of a once healthy stocks. While admitting that “some factors are out of our control as it relates to mitigating against global warming”, Mussington said both developing and developed countries need to do more. “We need to do things which will discontinue the rise in global temperatures and those things that need to happen have to do with less use of fossil fuels and modification of certain things that countries do,” he told IPS. In fact, the persons who are going to be suffering most – the people living in these Small Island Developing States – we are not the ones ultimately responsible in large measure for the problems we are having now, the developed countries are.” “So far the developed countries have been very resistant to implementing those policies and changes that need to happen,” Mussington added. In the end, he said the annual Conference of the Parties (COP) negotiations should not be simply about the smaller countries winning. “**It’s a fight that the world has to win if it is to survive because if the small states don’t win, it means that the globe as a whole does not win**, which means that **Planet Earth will lose out and the human race on planet earth might very well face total extinction**,” warned Mussington. “That’s what’s facing us. **The globe will become unlivable**,” he added.

## **Biodiversity DA -- 2nc Link**

### **Port dredging kills marine biodiversity -- multiple scenarios**

#### **European Commission Staff 11**

working document Integrating biodiversity and nature protection into port development Brussels, 08.03.20

[http://ec.europa.eu/transport/modes/maritime/doc/comm\\_sec\\_2011\\_0319.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/transport/modes/maritime/doc/comm_sec_2011_0319.pdf)

**Port infrastructure projects can have a wide range of impacts, notably on Natura 2000**, even if not all port developments concern Natura 2000 sites. **Potential impacts of ports on biodiversity cover a wide range – from degradation, fragmentation or loss of ecosystems and their services due to the land intake of port infrastructure, over contamination till the intrusion of invasive species, for which ports are one of the main entry points. Direct spatial impacts include loss of habitats due, e.g., to infrastructure developments and dredging activities.** Indirect impacts comprise disturbances due to maritime transport operations. To avoid potential impacts, it is essential that both strategic and detailed project planning fully integrate Natura 2000 considerations to avoid conflicts, costs and delays. **Ports need to be transparent with society about their projects and the environmental impacts thereof and communicate their efforts to avoid, mitigate or compensate negative impacts.**

### **Dredging → habitat loss -- displaces marine species**

**Phernambucq 93** – District Engineer, U.S. Army Engineer (Stanley G, “DREDGING: KEY LINK IN THE STRATEGIC NATIONAL DEFENSE”, 15 April 1993, <http://www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/GetTRDoc?Location=U2&doc=GefTRDoc.pdf&AD=ADA264544>)

**There are environmental resources that may be at risk during dredging activities. Dredging is not a benign activity; it disrupts habitats and redistributes sediments. These activities can significantly effect the coastal ecosystem and destroy marine life, especially sedentary invertebrates. These invertebrates are important parts of the food chain and contribute to the feeding of other fish; fish which are ultimately used for human consumption.**

**Other aquatic impacts of dredging include habitat loss when the sea bottom is altered.** This occurs when dredged materials are deposited at a location and its material composition is altered. **This decreases the diversity and abundance of certain species. Water circulation can be impacted when mounding occurs. This action can cause different siltation deposits and lead to the elimination of spawning areas.** Turbidity, or the suspension of sediments into the water column, can result in reduced light penetration and expose fish to abrasive materials.

Most importantly, **dredging has the potential of releasing comparatively large doses of toxic substances into a new aquatic environment and to make them available to marine organisms.** These materials include heavy metals, PCB's, pesticides, and other toxic materials that are certain to persist in marine life for quite some time.

Many species of marine life are sensitive to the impacts of dredging. The testing procedures previously described are designed to preclude the release of materials that could pose an unacceptable risk to marine life. The real dilemma arises as to how much is acceptable to the environment.<sup>2</sup>

### **Non- removed dredged materials cause fish to be sad from pollution**

#### **Delia et al. 10**

Faculty of Agriculture and Environment, Agricultural University of Tirana, Albania. Laboratory of Fishing and Aquaculture, Durres, Albania (Etleva Delia, Enkelejda Sallaku, Jerina Kolitan “The Environmental Impact of the Dredging in Port and Durres City” 5/25/10 [http://www.balwois.com/balwois/administration/full\\_paper/ffp-1648.pdf](http://www.balwois.com/balwois/administration/full_paper/ffp-1648.pdf))

The potential for environmental impact resulting from upland depends on the nature of the material and characteristics of the disposal site. **As dredged material placed in an upland environment dries, the material oxidizes and becomes lighter in color, accumulations of salt develop on the surface and precipitations tends to dissolve the salts that may then runoff. The oxidation process may promote**

the release of contaminants in surface water and groundwater and volatilizations of some contaminations may also occur. Fugitive dust may also disperse contaminants. The upland placement of dredging material can potentially affect water quality, groundwater quality, wildlife, plants and human health.

## **Biodiversity DA -- 2nc Marine Ecosystems Key**

**Marine ecosystems are key -- crucial lynchpin to other ecosystems and key to the US economy**

### **Hourigan 99**

(Thomas, National Marine Fisheries Service, NOAA, "CONSERVING OCEAN BIODIVERSITY: TRENDS AND CHALLENGES", [http://oceanservice.noaa.gov/websites/retiredsites/natdia\\_pdf/7hourigan.pdf](http://oceanservice.noaa.gov/websites/retiredsites/natdia_pdf/7hourigan.pdf).)

**The ocean's biological diversity**—the living resources that compose it and the ecological processes that sustain it—**forms a foundation for the quality of human life** as well as the raw materials to enrich it. Biological diversity, or biodiversity, refers to the variety and variability among living organisms, and among the ecological complexes of which they are a part. **Marine living resources provide essential economic, environmental, aesthetic, and cultural benefits to humanity. Sixteen percent of all animal protein consumed worldwide comes from the ocean.** The United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) estimates the total value to fishers of the world's commercial marine catch at \$80 billion per year. **The comparable value of fishes landed in the United States is \$3.5 billion**, and commercial fisheries contribute \$21 billion to the U.S. economy. Besides food, **marine living resources provide myriad products** including fertilizers, animal feed, medicines, and aquarium fishes. **The value of marine biodiversity extends far beyond fisheries and other products. Marine ecosystems also provide natural goods and services such as carbon storage, atmospheric gas regulation, nutrient cycling, and waste treatment. Coral reefs, mangroves, and kelp forests protect coastal areas from storm damage. Marine algae contribute nearly 40 percent of global photosynthesis.** The values of these marine ecosystem services greatly exceed direct use values, yet they generally are not incorporated into economic or policy calculations. Globally, the value of marine ecosystem services has been estimated at \$8.4 trillion per annum for open ocean ecosystems, and \$12.6 trillion for coastal ecosystems (Costanza et al. 1997). These **services depend on marine biodiversity**, even though the processes that underlie this dependence are still unclear. **As human populations increase, demands have accelerated for food, products, and services from the ocean**, as well as for living and recreational space on its shores. The **primary threats to marine biodiversity are** fisheries operations (both direct overfishing and indirect fishing impacts—e.g., bycatch of non-target and protected species, **habitat destruction by trawls and other gear or techniques**, and other ecosystem effects that may accompany fishing activities), chemical **pollution and eutrophication**, **physical alteration of coastal and marine habitats**, invasions of exotic species, and ultraviolet-B radiation damage to phytoplankton and zooplankton resulting from stratospheric ozone depletion (NRC 1995). Looming on the horizon is the threat of human-caused climate change with potentially major negative effects on tourism, freshwater supplies, fisheries, and biodiversity. These factors also have been identified by the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity<sup>2</sup> as key threats (UNEP/CBD 1995).



## **Biodiversity DA -- 2nc Turns Coastal Erosion**

**Marine biodiversity turns the case -- key to solve disaster response and climate adaptation**

### **World Wildlife Fund 8**

"Biodiversity Loss Puts People At Risk: World Wildlife Fund." ScienceDaily. ScienceDaily, 20 May 2008. <[www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2008/05/080516112715.htm](http://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2008/05/080516112715.htm)>.

Future generations face hunger, thirst, disease and disaster if we carry on losing biodiversity. And as biodiversity plummets our use of resources soars. WWF now estimates that **biodiversity has declined by more than a quarter in the last 35 years**. The stark warning comes as WWF launches its 2010 and Beyond: Rising to the Biodiversity Challenge report which contains the latest Living Planet index – the internationally agreed way to measure progress towards the global target of reducing biodiversity loss by 2010– and which reveals a continuing decline in biodiversity. Food, clean water, medicines and protection from natural hazards are important ingredients in maintaining our security and quality of life. If they are to be maintained then the **species, natural habitats and ecosystems** that support them **need to be protected**. In 2002 the world's governments set themselves a target to reduce the rate of biodiversity loss by 2010, but WWF's report shows that they are clearly not on track.

"**Biodiversity underpins the health of the planet and has a direct impact on all our lives**". Put simply, **reduced biodiversity means millions of people face a future where food supplies are more vulnerable** to pests and disease and where water is in irregular or short supply," said James Leape, WWF International's Director General. "**No one can escape the impact of biodiversity loss because reduced global diversity translates** quite clearly **into** fewer new medicines, **greater vulnerability to natural disasters and greater effects from global warming**."

## **Biodiversity DA -- 2nc Generic Biodiversity Loss → Exn**

### **Biodiversity collapse will cause extinction.**

#### **Coyne 7**

Jerry Coyne, Professor of Ecology at UChicago and Hopi Hoekstra, Professor of Biology at Harvard (9/24/2007 <http://www.truthout.org/article/jerry-coyne-and-hopi-e-hoekstra-the-greatest-dying>)

Aside from the Great Dying, **there have been four other mass extinctions, all of which severely pruned life's diversity.** Scientists agree that **we're now in the midst of a sixth such episode. This new one**, however, **is** different - and, in many ways, **much worse**. For, unlike earlier extinctions, **this one results from the work of a single species, Homo sapiens.** **We are relentlessly taking over the planet, laying it to waste and eliminating most of our fellow species.** Moreover, **we're doing it much faster than the mass extinctions that came before.** Every year, up to 30,000 species disappear due to human activity alone. At this rate, **we could lose half of Earth's species in this century.** And, **unlike with previous extinctions, there's no hope that biodiversity will ever recover,** since the cause of the decimation - us - is here to stay. To scientists, this is an unparalleled calamity, far more severe than global warming, which is, after all, only one of many threats to biodiversity. Yet global warming gets far more press. Why? One reason is that, while **the increase in temperature is easy to document, the decrease of species is not.** Biologists don't know, for example, exactly how many species exist on Earth. Estimates range widely, from three million to more than 50 million, and that doesn't count microbes, critical (albeit invisible) components of ecosystems. We're not certain about the rate of extinction, either; how could we be, since the vast majority of species have yet to be described? We're even less sure how the loss of some species will affect the ecosystems in which they're embedded, since the intricate connection between organisms means that the loss of a single species can ramify unpredictably. But we do know some things. Tropical rainforests are disappearing at a rate of 2 percent per year. Populations of most large fish are down to only 10 percent of what they were in 1950. Many primates and all the great apes - our closest relatives - are nearly gone from the wild. And we know that extinction and global warming act synergistically. Extinction exacerbates global warming: By burning rainforests, we're not only polluting the atmosphere with carbon dioxide (a major greenhouse gas) but destroying the very plants that can remove this gas from the air. Conversely, global warming increases extinction, both directly (killing corals) and indirectly (destroying the habitats of Arctic and Antarctic animals). As extinction increases, then, so does global warming, which in turn causes more extinction - and so on, into a downward spiral of destruction. Why, exactly, should we care? Let's start with the most celebrated case: the rainforests. Their loss will worsen global warming - raising temperatures, melting icecaps, and flooding coastal cities. And, as the forest habitat shrinks, so begins the inevitable contact between organisms that have not evolved together, a scenario played out many times, and one that is never good. **Dreadful diseases have successfully jumped species boundaries, with humans as prime recipients.** We have gotten aids from apes, sars from civets, and Ebola from fruit bats. Additional **worldwide plagues from unknown microbes are a very real possibility.** But it isn't just the destruction of the rainforests that should trouble us. **Healthy ecosystems the world over provide hidden services like waste disposal, nutrient cycling, soil formation, water purification, and oxygen production. Such services are best rendered by ecosystems that are diverse.** Yet, through both intention and accident, humans have introduced exotic species that turn biodiversity into monoculture. Fast-growing zebra mussels, for example, have outcompeted more than 15 species of native mussels in North America's Great Lakes and have damaged harbors and water-treatment plants. **Native prairies are becoming dominated by single species (often genetically homogenous) of corn or wheat. Thanks to these developments, soils will erode**

**and become unproductive - which, along with temperature change, will diminish agricultural yields.** Meanwhile, with increased pollution and runoff, as well as reduced forest cover, **ecosystems will no longer be able to purify water; and a shortage of clean water spells disaster.** **In many ways, oceans are the most vulnerable areas of all.** As overfishing eliminates major predators, while polluted and warming waters kill off phytoplankton, the intricate aquatic food web could collapse from both sides. **Fish, on which so many humans depend, will be a fond memory.** **As phytoplankton vanish, so does the ability of the oceans to absorb carbon dioxide and produce oxygen.** (Half of the oxygen we breathe is made by phytoplankton, with the rest coming from land plants.) **Species extinction is also imperiling coral reefs - a major problem since these reefs have far more than recreational value: They provide tremendous amounts of food for human populations and buffer coastlines against erosion.** In fact, the global value of "hidden" services provided by ecosystems - those services, like waste disposal, that aren't bought and sold in the marketplace - has been estimated to be as much as \$50 trillion per year, roughly equal to the gross domestic product of all countries combined. And that doesn't include tangible goods like fish and timber. **Life as we know it would be impossible if ecosystems collapsed.** **Yet that is where we're heading if species extinction continues at its current pace.** **Extinction also has a huge impact on medicine.** Who really cares if, say, a worm in the remote swamps of French Guiana goes extinct? Well, those who suffer from cardiovascular disease. **The recent discovery of a rare South American leech has led to the isolation of a powerful enzyme that, unlike other anticoagulants, not only prevents blood from clotting but also dissolves existing clots.** And it's not just this one species of worm: Its wriggly relatives have evolved other biomedically valuable proteins, including antistatin (a potential anticancer agent), decorsin and ornatin (platelet aggregation inhibitors), and hirudin (another anticoagulant). **Plants, too, are pharmaceutical gold mines.** The bark of trees, for example, has given us quinine (the first cure for malaria), taxol (a drug highly effective against ovarian and breast cancer), and aspirin. **More than a quarter of the medicines on our pharmacy shelves were originally derived from plants.** The sap of the Madagascar periwinkle contains more than 70 useful alkaloids, including vincristine, a powerful anticancer drug that saved the life of one of our friends. Of the roughly 250,000 plant species on Earth, fewer than 5 percent have been screened for pharmaceutical properties. Who knows what life-saving drugs remain to be discovered? Given current extinction rates, it's estimated that we're losing one valuable drug every two years. Our arguments so far have tacitly assumed that species are worth saving only in proportion to their economic value and their effects on our quality of life, an attitude that is strongly ingrained, especially in Americans. That is why conservationists always base their case on an economic calculus. But we biologists know in our hearts that **there are deeper and equally compelling reasons to worry about the loss of biodiversity: namely, simple morality and intellectual values that transcend pecuniary interests.** What, for example, gives us the right to destroy other creatures? And what could be more thrilling than looking around us, seeing that we are surrounded by our evolutionary cousins, and realizing that we all got here by the same simple process of natural selection? To biologists, and potentially everyone else, apprehending the genetic kinship and common origin of all species is a spiritual experience - not necessarily religious, but spiritual nonetheless, for it stirs the soul. But, whether or not one is moved by such concerns, **it is certain that our future is bleak if we do nothing to stem this sixth extinction.** **We are creating a world in which exotic diseases flourish but natural medicinal cures are lost; a world in which carbon waste accumulates while food sources dwindle; a world of sweltering heat, failing crops, and impure water.** In the end, **we must accept the possibility that we ourselves**

**are not immune to extinction.** Or, if we survive, perhaps only a few of us will remain, **scratching out a grubby existence on a devastated planet.** Global warming will seem like a secondary problem when **humanity finally faces the consequences of what we have done to nature: not just another Great Dying, but perhaps the greatest dying of them all.**

## **Biodiversity loss leads to extinction**

### **Diner gender paraphrased 94**

Military Law Review Winter 1994 143 Mil. L. Rev. 161 LENGTH: 30655 words ARTICLE: THE ARMY AND THE ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT: WHO'S ENDANGERING WHOM? NAME: MAJOR DAVID N. DINER BIO: Judge Advocate General's Corps, United States Army.

**Biologically diverse ecosystems are characterized by a large number of specialist species, filling narrow ecological niches. These ecosystems inherently are more stable than less diverse systems. "The more complex the ecosystem, the more successfully it can resist a stress. . . . [l]ike a net, in which each knot is connected to others by several strands, such a fabric can resist collapse better than a simple, unbranched circle of threads -- which if cut anywhere breaks down as a whole."**<sup>n79</sup> By causing widespread extinctions, humans have artificially simplified many ecosystems. As biologic simplicity increases, so does the risk of ecosystem failure. The spreading Sahara Desert in Africa, and the dustbowl conditions of the 1930s in the United States are relatively mild examples of what might be expected if this trend continues. Theoretically, **each new animal or plant extinction, with all its dimly perceived and intertwined affects, could cause total ecosystem collapse and human extinction. Each new extinction increases the risk of disaster. Like a mechanic removing, one by one, the rivets from an aircraft's wings, n80 [hu]mankind may be edging closer to the abyss.**

## **Biodiversity DA -- 2nc Oxygen Impact**

### **Sea otters threatened now -- starfish die-off ensures sea otters extinction**

#### **Venton & Nature Magazine**

(Danielle, Journalist for Scientific American, “Clues Sought for Sea Star Die-Off”, Dec. 16<sup>th</sup>, 2013, <http://www.scientificamerican.com/article/clues-sought-for-sea-star-die-off/>)

In their waterproof orange overalls, Hannah Perlkin and Emily Tucker look like commercial fishermen or storm-ready sailors. But they are **biologists** on their way to tide pools along a remote stretch of northern California coast. There they **are searching for the cause of a mysterious and unprecedented die-off of** sea stars along North America’s Pacific shores. The syndrome took marine scientists by surprise this summer, when sick and dying sea stars — also known as **starfish** — appeared in a host of locations between Alaska and southern California. Predatory species were the first to succumb, but now the mysterious ailment is appearing in species once thought to be resistant to its effects. The progression is predictable: white lesions appear on an animal and become infected. Within hours or days the sea star becomes limp, and its arms may fall off. Necrosis eventually takes over and the animal dies. “It’s like a zombie wasteland,” says Tucker, who is, like Perlkin, a field technician employed by the University of California, Santa Cruz (UCSC). “You’ll see detached arms crawling away from their body.” **Among the animals now affected are** the scavenger bat star, *Asterina miniata*; some species of **sea urchin**, **an** **important source of food for threatened sea otters**; and recreational and commercially fished species such as the California spiny lobster (*Panulirus interruptus*) and sheephead fish (*Semicossyphus pulcher*).

### **Sea otters are key to kelp forests -- turns the case -- kelp forests are key to solve coastline storm surge**

#### **Seaotters.com 13**

(“Why are Sea Otters Important? No Sea Otters. No Kelp Forests”, <http://seaotters.com/2013/05/23/why-are-sea-otters-important-no-sea-otters-no-kelp-forests/>)

**Sea otters are** an iconic species, representing the beauty and diversity of marine life found along California’s coastline. They’re also **considered a keystone species because of their critical importance to the health and stability of the** nearshore **marine ecosystem**. They eat sea urchins and other invertebrates that graze on giant kelp. **Without sea otters**, these **grazing animals can** **destroy kelp forests** and consequently the wide diversity of animals that depend upon kelp habitat for survival. Additionally, **kelp forests protect coastlines from** **storm surge** and absorb vast amounts of harmful carbon dioxide from the atmosphere. Sea otters are also considered a sentinel species because their health reflects that of California’s coastal waters.

### **Impact is extinction -- collapse of kelp forests causes loss of vital oxygen supply -- land plants don’t fill-in, makes the Earth unliveable**

#### **Hall 11**

(Dr. Jack, Chair of the Department of Environmental Studies at the University of North Carolina, Wilmington, “The Most Important Organism?”, September 12, 2011, <http://www.ecology.com/2011/09/12/important-organism/>)

On a recent fossil collecting trip a friend asked, “**What do you think is the most important organism** on the Earth?” She knew full well I would answer, “Humans!” since we are the masters of our domain and without rival in the animal world (are we good or what?). She was a bit surprised, and gave me the “Are you nuts?” look, when, without hesitation, I answered, “**No doubt about it...** hands down the most important organism on this planet is marine algae.” “**Algae**?!?” she said. “Yes, Algae,” I answered. “Do you want an explanation or are you going to take my word on this?” I asked. “Let me think about it and I’ll get back to you on that one,” she said. As we continued our hunt for shark’s teeth, whale bones and anything else we could find, she finally broke down. “I don’t

get it. We can change the world in so many ways....what has algae done? “Very simple,” I said. “**Algae allow us and almost every other organism you can think of, living or dead, to be here.**” Suddenly, she got that look. You know, the one you get when that light bulb in your head clicks on...bing, there it is! “Ah, oxygen, right?”

“Correctomundo!” was my very scientific reply. Life-giving Slime It is estimated that **marine plants produce**

**between 70 and 80 percent of the oxygen in the atmosphere**. Nearly all marine plants are single celled, photosynthetic algae. Yup, that’s right, good ol’ scum on the pond...green gak....slip slimein’ away. Even marine seaweed is many times colonial algae. They are a bunch of single cells trying to look like a big plant (see seaweed photo), but they are really individuals. We need marine algae a whole lot more than they need us. Think about it, 70 percent to 80 percent of all the oxygen we breathe comes from algae! Without them we would really be sucking wind, but not for long! At this point, you may be saying, “Yo! What about the trees and other land plants?” **Trees and other**

**land plants are very important**, no doubt about it. **But for pure survival, we couldn’t make it without**

**algae**. Why does so much of our oxygen come from algae? First of all, remember that the oceans cover about 71 percent of this planet and land is only about 29 percent. If we assume that every square mile of the ocean produces as much oxygen as every square mile of land, then this makes sense. The oceans would produce about 71 percent and the land 29 percent of the oxygen we breathe. Looks like we are in the ballpark, don’t you think? Are Oceans as Productive as Land? Now the question is, “Are the oceans, indeed, as productive as the land?” At first you might not think so, after all when you look at the land there are trees, bushes and grass and all kinds of plants growing. They must crank out oxygen to beat the band! They do, but also remember that there are many places on land that don’t have much in the way of plants. How about Antarctica or the Sahara Desert along with many others? These are good-sized chunks of real estate where plants are rare. How much oxygen is being pumped out in these areas? **Some areas on land have an abundance of plants** and produce a large quantity of oxygen.

while **others have very few** plants and produce very little. **The same can be said for the oceans.** **There**

**are some areas that have an abundance of algae** living in the waters and other areas that don’t. In the ocean, there are areas of upwelling where cold, nutrient rich bottom water moves toward the surface. These upwelling waters mix with the surface water and produce an area that is like liquid fertilizer for plants. They go ballistic and there are billions of the little critters in the water just pumping out oxygen left and right. Other areas of the oceans don’t have much in the way of nutrients in the water and they are like the deserts on land with very few plants. Overall, the production of oxygen in the oceans is at least equal to the production on land, if not a bit more. Plants on land are easy to spot. Plants in the ocean are a bit more difficult to see since they are single cells floating in the water. Even though you may not see them, they are there. Remember, these little cells go down to over 300 feet below the surface so they have lots of room to spread out. Plants on land and in the ocean are extremely important to us and we wouldn’t be here without them. Land plants provide us (and other critters) with food, raw materials like wood and fiber to make cloth and paper. They protect the land from erosion with their roots, provide beauty and shade on a hot day and produce oxygen as an added bonus although we could probably survive with the oxygen. Marine plants are also used as food, but we tend to forget about them because they are so small and difficult to see. But remember, the next time you wake up in the morning, stretch and open wide with that big morning yawn, **that breath of fresh air you are getting is due for the most part to** our friend, **the**

**algae.** **If we kill them by polluting the oceans, we are also killing our vital lifeline.** More Interesting Facts...

There are more than 7,000 different species of algae. Most live in the oceans, but they also live in fresh water and even on land. Also, algae produce about 330 billion tons of oxygen each year. There are three types of algae: red, green and brown. Some algae in the ocean are very small and drift in the ocean water. Those algae are phytoplankton. The most abundant type of algae is brown algae, with over 5,000 species (not all are totally brown). Red algae has over 2,000 species, and lives where light is dim, in deeper waters, mostly in temperate and tropical waters. Green algae are more common on land and in fresh water systems, but are the least common in the ocean where about 800 are known to exist.

**\*\*Begin Photo Caption\*\* Kelp is a type of marine algae**, or seaweed. Seaweeds come in three different color varieties, red, green and brown. Kelp is a kind of brown seaweed **that grows to be very large**. Although kelp resembles a kind of weed or tree, it is quite different from plants that grow on land. **\*\*End Photo Caption\*\***

## **Biodiversity DA -- 2nc Antibiotics Impact**

### **Marine ecosystem destruction leads to coral reef bleaching -- climate change puts reefs on the brink, controlling non-climate stressors is key**

#### **Marine Technical Team 11**

(Marine Technical Team of national, government-wide strategy to safeguard fish, wildlife, plants, and the natural systems upon which they depend, February 4<sup>th</sup>, 2011, "Marine Ecosystems", [http://www.wildlifeadaptationstrategy.gov/pdf/Marine\\_Ecosystems\\_Paper.pdf](http://www.wildlifeadaptationstrategy.gov/pdf/Marine_Ecosystems_Paper.pdf))

**Coral reefs are one the most productive ecosystems on Earth. At the heart** of the coral reef's success **is a symbiotic relationship between coral and microscopic algae** within the living coral. The coral provides the nutrients that the algae need to capture CO<sub>2</sub> through photosynthesis. The algae, in turn, provide coral with the carbon they need to build their skeletons—and thus, the reef itself. **A changing climate is threatening this symbiotic relationship** and the whole coral reef ecosystem. **When sea temperatures rise** too much, the **coral expel their algae, a process called bleaching** (since the coral become whiter without their symbionts). In 2005, up to 90 percent of shallow-water corals in the British Virgin Islands bleached in response to increased water temperatures (Wilkinson and Souter 2008). **Bleaching has profound effects on corals** and the loss of the symbionts can ultimately cause the bleached coral to starve to death. Bleaching isn't the only threat to coral. Rapid increases in the atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> concentration, and thus, ocean acidification, may be the final insult to these ecosystems. The absorption of atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> by the world's oceans contributes to chemical reactions which ultimately reduce the amount of carbonate making it unavailable to coral to build their skeletons (Hoegh-Guldberg et al. 2007). **An effort is underway to try to protect coral reefs by making them more resilient to climate change.** The Nature Conservancy has started a Reef Resilience program, working in the Florida Keys in partnership with the State of Florida, NOAA, and Australia's Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority, to understand the non-climate factors that adversely affect coral reefs such as damage from charter and private vessels and improper erosion control. The hope is that **by reducing these non-climate stressors, the coral will be better able to resist being bleached when sea temperatures increase**. A related approach, being studied by scientists at the University of Miami, Australia Institute of Marine Science, and elsewhere, is actively inoculating corals with algal symbionts that are resistant to higher water temperatures.

### **Coral reefs are key to new medicines, ocean bio-diversity, and the economy**

#### **NOAA 8**

March 25, 2008 [http://oceanservice.noaa.gov/education/kits/corals/coral07\\_importance.html](http://oceanservice.noaa.gov/education/kits/corals/coral07_importance.html)

Coral reefs are some of the most diverse and valuable ecosystems on Earth. **Coral reefs support more species per unit area than any other marine environment**, including about 4,000 species of fish, 800 species of hard corals and hundreds of other species. Scientists estimate that **there may be another 1 to 8 million undiscovered species of organisms living in and around reefs** (Reaka-Kudla, 1997). **This biodiversity is considered key to finding new medicines for the 21st century**. **Many drugs are now being developed from coral reef animals and plants as possible cures for cancer, arthritis, human bacterial infections, viruses, and other diseases.** **Storehouses of immense biological wealth,** reefs **also provide** economic and **environmental services** to millions of people. Coral reefs may provide goods and services worth \$375 billion each year. This is an amazing figure for an environment that covers less than 1 percent of the Earth's surface (Costanza et al., 1997) Healthy reefs contribute to local economies through tourism. Diving tours, fishing trips, hotels, restaurants, and other businesses based near reef systems provide millions of jobs and contribute billions of dollars all over the world. Recent studies show that millions of people visit coral reefs in the Florida Keys every year. These reefs alone are estimated to have an asset value of \$7.6 billion (Johns et al., 2001).

## **Antibiotic development is an existential threat -- new medicine development is key to solve superbugs that ensure extinction**

### **Parady & Kresnawati 14**

(Vida & Dr. Windi, members of volunteer team working to raise awareness on the proper use of antibiotics from NGO Yayasan Orangtua Peduli (YOP) and ReAct, an independent global network for concerted action on antibiotic resistance, "Saving Antibiotics in the Battle Against Superbugs", 28 March 2014, <http://www.magdalene.co/news-128-saving-antibiotics-in-the-battle-against-superbugs-.html>)

American Medical Association (AMA) in 1995: "**The world is faced with increasingly rampant bacteria that have become resistant against** the entire existing **antibiotics**. It creates extraordinary public health crisis." **We are currently facing a life-threatening crisis**. Curable diseases such as tuberculosis, gonorrhea and typhoid fever currently cannot be cured due to antibiotic resistance. The improper use of antibiotics does not only create loss for patients, but also for the environment. **The superbugs will infect the entire population, and nothing will work against it**, even if some in the population only use certain antibiotic for the first time.



## **Politics DA**

## Partisanship Link

### **The way port dredging is funded is unpopular Gale 12**

(Kevin Gale, Feb 14, 2012, Editor in Chief- South Florida Business Journal, "Port dredging is a hot topic in D.C." <http://www.bizjournals.com/southflorida/blog/2012/02/port-dredging-is-hot-topic-in-dc.html>) MB

**Some members of Congress are starting to get antsy about getting East Coast harbors dredged to accommodate post-Panamax ships.** While PortMiami has \$77 million in state funding to help launch its project, **ports further north are fighting for federal funding.** In his Fine Print column in The Washington Post on Tuesday, Walter Pincus tells how the Senate Armed Services Committee grilled Army Lt. Gen. Thomas Bostick, who has been nominated to lead the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. (Bostick is already facing a roadblock from Sen. Rand Paul, R-Ky., over repairs on a dam in his home state.) **The problem for ports and their congressmen is that earmarks aren't supposed to happen anymore, and that's a classic way for port dredging projects to get funded.**

### **Republicans hate funding port dredging - it's a partisan issue Bendavid and McWhirter 10**

(Cameron Mcwhirter and Naftali Bendavid, December 1, 2010, Bendavid is he Congressional reporter for The Wall Street JournalMcwhirter is a staff reporter for The Wall Street Journal "Projects Test Resolve on Earmarks"

[http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748703994904575647152924275836.html?mod=WSJ\\_Election\\_LeftTopStories](http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748703994904575647152924275836.html?mod=WSJ_Election_LeftTopStories)) MB

SAVANNAH, Ga.—**Congressional Republicans are eagerly promoting their promise to abstain from earmarks, saying the move is necessary to contain federal spending and mollify voters angry at Washington.** But **the pledge made on the campaign trail is proving more complicated in practice.** A container ship heads upriver to the Port of Savannah, which is seeking \$105 million in federal funds to begin deepening its harbor. **Some senators' resolve is being tested as two of the nation's major ports,** one here and another in Charleston, S.C., urgently **seek funding to expand.** Port officials say federal dollars will be crucial next year so they can deepen their harbors to accommodate bigger ships after the Panama Canal is widened and reopens in 2014. **It isn't clear that can be done without earmarking—**special funding that lawmakers request for projects in their home states. The Savannah port is seeking \$105 million for the upcoming fiscal year to begin dredging the port, while Charleston wants \$400,000 for a feasibility study for its own deepening project. If the ports cannot receive the mega-ships, Savannah and Charleston officials say, the cargo will go to New York or Norfolk, Va., which they argue would be inefficient and deliver an economic blow to the Southeast, costing jobs. **Earmarks were denounced by conservative activists during the recent midterm election campaigns, and Republicans in both chambers banned them last month.** But several GOP senators have suggested they'll make exceptions if they see fit, including three of the four from Georgia and South Carolina. Spending on items such as ports, bridges and roads are included in the president's annual budget, which is then reviewed by congressional committees. It's at that point that lawmakers often go to a committee chairman to get their earmarked projects inserted. Individual projects could also be funded in free-standing bills, but that would be impractical, given how numerous such projects are. **The controversial nature of earmarks was highlighted Tuesday when the Senate voted 56-39 against expanding an earmark ban** to the full chamber that was similar to the one adopted by Senate Republicans at a closed-door meeting Nov. 16. Sen. Lindsey Graham (R., S.C.) supports the earmark ban but has vowed to earmark funds for the Charleston port if necessary. "I'm in a spot where I have to get the port deepened for economic reasons," he said. Democrats from the region say the ban never made any sense. "Charleston is going to be dead in

the water because of this short-sighted myopic view that seems to be controlling," said Rep. James Clyburn (D., S.C.). Savannah, the second-busiest port on the East Coast after the Port of New York/New Jersey, has been pressing an application with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers since 1999 to dredge the Savannah River from its current 42-feet depth at low tide to 48 feet. This month, the Corps recommended dredging to 47 feet. The cost has been estimated at about \$600 million—\$400 million of which would be sought in federal funds. Anxious port officials have recruited Kasim Reed, the Democratic mayor of Atlanta and an ally of President Barack Obama, to push the administration for funding. **Some Republicans had been concerned that their earmark ban would lead to a transfer of power over budgeting decisions to the president.** Curtis Foltz, executive director of the Georgia Ports Authority, said in an interview that he and other officials had visited Washington repeatedly to lobby the White House and the state's congressional delegation. Having no port for large ships in the Southeast would increase the cost of transporting imported and exported goods from one of the fastest-growing parts of the nation, he said. "This is not infrastructure for a water park or a bicycle path," Mr. Foltz said. "This is infrastructure that is absolutely necessary for the nation." Georgia's Republican senators are touting their opposition to earmarks but also suggesting they'll do whatever it takes for the port. "My position has consistently been, I'm going to support reform or total elimination of earmarks," said Sen. Saxby Chambliss (R., Ga.). "But if a project is vital to the economy and jobs of my state, I'm sent here by the people of my state to make sure their interests are looked after." Sen. Johnny Isakson (R., Ga.), who also supported the ban, said he would "continue to fight for funding for projects such as the expansion of the Savannah port that is critical to my state and to U.S. trade." Many senators are allowing themselves such wiggle room. Other **Republicans oppose the ban outright and are not committed to abstaining from earmarks at all.** Democrats, who have a majority in the Senate, have not adopted a ban. In the House, the earmark ban may be more effective, since **Republicans will control that chamber and say they won't advance any bill that includes such projects.**

## Public Popularity Link

### **Plan unpopular with the public—perceive ports as a liability**

**Tirschwell 08** — Senior Adviser of the Journal of Commerce (Peter, “Ports face uphill climb in gaining acceptance”, Seaports Magazine, Winter, [http://www.aapaseaports.com/pdf\\_issues/AAPASeaports\\_Winter2008.pdf](http://www.aapaseaports.com/pdf_issues/AAPASeaports_Winter2008.pdf)) EL

The simple fact is one that’s hardly inspiring or even encouraging: As much as those of us connected with seaports might prefer things to be otherwise, **for the general public,** to the extent they think about them, **ports are more liability than asset, if anything a problem waiting to happen or which has already happened. Ports today often find themselves on the wrong side of the conversation. They are seen as ugly when people want their surroundings to be pretty. They are seen as dirty when people are insisting their environment be clean. They facilitate imports that people see as taking away jobs. And they are seen as affording exposure to a dangerous outside world at a time when people want their communities to be safe.**

Thankfully, **politicians often appreciate ports for the economic value** they provide to cities, regions and the nation, **but, as elected officials, they must balance community interests in ways that can restrict port activity or expansion.** The result of this is that ports constantly find themselves on the defensive in dealing with local journalists, community groups or elected officials. It can be frustrating for port staff members who understand the value they provide to be constantly forced to defend their actions against openly hostile interests. **Ports have a steep uphill climb to gain credibility and acceptance among their communities, and, if a crisis isn’t properly managed, years of effort can be lost in an instant.** I think the first step is to acknowledge **this is the way it is, and it probably won’t change.** The frustration ports encounter day to day in dealing with an indifferent or unfriendly press and public cannot divert them from pursuing the long-term goal of greater understanding and acceptance from the community.

## **States CP**

## States CP 1nc Solvency

### **States can do the plan – report from Army Corps proves**

#### **AP 12**

associated press (The Associated Press, “Price tag to dredge Eastern ports for big ships: \$5 billion”, 6/22/12, <http://www.usatoday.com/money/economy/story/2012-06-21/southern-ports-expansion/55746890/1>) // CB

**The Southeast**, forecast to undergo the nation's biggest growth in population and trade, remains too shallow from Virginia to South Florida and across the Gulf to Texas.

**The need for expanding port capacity "is likely to be most critical along the U.S. Southeast and Gulf coasts,"** the report said.

That's because **no shipping channels are at least 50 feet deep, which will be required for the ships** — many from China and other Asian countries — that will begin using the Panama Canal after a major expansion is completed by the end of 2014.

Savannah, Ga., Charleston, S.C., and Miami on the Southeast coast, as well as several **ports in the Gulf, are** already undertaking harbor-deepening projects. None have advanced beyond studies to actual dredging, however.

In April, the Corps completed a 12-year study on the Port of Savannah — the nation's fourth busiest container port — which wants \$652 million in taxpayer funds to deepen more than 30 miles of river.

The Corps said 17 such projects are being studied overall, and the cost of harbor expansions across the Southeast would likely be \$3 billion to \$5 billion.

"Strategically, we need to find a bucket of money to fund the projects that need to happen to keep our nation competitive," said Curtis Foltz, executive director of the Georgia Ports Authority, which is seeking final permits and funding to start deepening the Savannah harbor next year. The budget crisis has made federal funding for port projects extremely tight, especially since Congress and President Obama for the past two years have sworn off so-called "earmark" spending that was used to fund such projects in the past.

**The Army Corps report said current funding levels for port improvements won't cover all the projects that should be done.**

**If Congress won't increase the agency's funding for harbor projects, the report said,** then perhaps state governments and private companies such as shipping lines should be required to pay a greater share.

Another alternative would do away with the current cost-sharing system.

Ports would include the cost of deepening in the fees they charge shippers and could borrow from a federal infrastructure bank for major projects.

## **States CP 2nc Solvency**

**Savannah funding disputes prove the states can act independently with their own money**

**Bynum 4/26**

news reporter (Russ, “Georgia would fund Savannah River port deepening if Washington doesn’t, Gov. Nathan Deal says” Associated Press, 4/26/12, <http://www.postandcourier.com/article/20120426/PC05/120429432/1005&slId=6>)  
// CB

SAVANNAH — once it’s time to start dredging.

Deal, speaking at the Port of Savannah on Tuesday, said **Gov. Nathan Deal said he would have Georgia taxpayers pay a heftier portion of the \$653 million tab to deepen the Savannah harbor rather than delay the project if the federal government hasn’t funded its share**  
**he believes Washington should honor its commitment to cover 60 percent of the project. But with federal dollars still tight and time running out before supersized cargo ships can start using an expanded Panama Canal, the governor said he is willing to do what is necessary to begin deepening the Savannah River as soon as possible.**

**Asked what would happen if the president and Congress do not find dredging money for the harbor soon, Deal said, “We’ll spend our money.”**

**Savannah and other East Coast ports are racing to deepen their harbors in anticipation of mammoth container ships arriving via Panama once its canal expansion is finished in 2014**

“We hope we don’t get to that point,” he said. “But it may be one of those things that, if that becomes necessary, we begin the project and hopefully get (federal) funding after the fact to reimburse the state.”  
, including Charleston, .

## **24/7 Ports CP**



## 24/7 Ports CP 1nc Solvency

**Text:**

**Allowing US ports to run 24 hours solves congestion and improves efficiency -- impossible to improve pace of shipping without longer hours**

**Depillis 13**

Lydia Depillis, writer for the Huffington post, "Chinese ports operate around the clock. Why don't America's?" August 5, 2013, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/wonkblog/wp/2013/08/05/chinese-ports-operate-around-the-clock-why-dont-americas/>

**It's no secret that China exports a lot of stuff, nor that the country's ports are the busiest in the world -- seven of the top 10 ports by container volume are Chinese.** But it's harder to get information about how productive those ports are. For competitive reasons, ports themselves don't want to disclose how quickly ships are loaded and unloaded, and most national governments don't require it. But here's who does want to know that: Shipping lines, as well as the companies that own the goods they carry. Five years ago, a shipping trade publication called the Journal of Commerce embarked upon a project to collect that data, and convinced 17 carriers representing 70 percent of global ocean transport to turn over what they knew about how quickly containers move and how long their vessels remain in their berths. The result is a white paper ranking the world's ports by how effective they are in moving cargo for their size. Surprise surprise: **U.S. ports come out looking pretty dismal. The U.S., not that great at operating ports.** (Journal of Commerce) **Why are China, Japan, South Korea, and the UAE so much better at moving containers around than the United States? They're not, necessarily -- it's more a matter of down time. Chinese ports,** for example, **operate around the clock** with gangs of dockworkers who aren't paid that much or treated that well. **Most U.S. ports operate only one or two shifts a day,** since longshoremen's union contracts require overtime pay for working in the middle of the night (and their pay is already higher than it is for any other blue-collar trade, reaching into the six figures). So even if they're as efficient at moving containers on a per-hour basis, they'll still be less productive overall. **That has real consequences for shipping companies, since their vessels can't simply dump their cargo, pick up another load, and move on. Instead, they have to book it to the next port of call, which is less fuel efficient than moving at a more leisurely pace, costing them tens of thousands of dollars more for gasoline. In addition, it slows down the pace of goods generally, which raises costs for consumers.** **"It's a bottleneck in the supply chain, and it requires extra planning** on the part of Wal-Mart, so they can get their goods in their stores when they need to be," says the Journal of Commerce's Peter Tirschwell, who oversaw the report. "All supply chain disruptions raise costs for the consumer, no question about it." Not only that, but they can simply push business elsewhere. **A relatively new port north of Vancouver,** Prince Rupert, **has been attracting ships that used to go to Seattle and Tacoma, since containers can get to the Midwest faster and cheaper from there via train than they would if they were snarled for days in a congested port.** Tirschwell says that even though U.S. imports and exports cooled off during the recession, they're still rising, and ships are getting bigger. If U.S. ports don't get more productive, costs will just keep going up, putting a real pinch on the stuff we're able to buy and sell overseas. The barely-avoided longshoremen strikes last year show how difficult it can be to change how ports operate. But it seems like **making it easier to work during the night would be a good way to start.**

## **24/7 Ports CP 2nc Solvency**

### **24/7 US port service is key to trade competitiveness and reducing transportation costs -- biggest productivity gap**

#### **Tirschwell 13**

(Peter, Executive Vice President/Chief Content Officer, The Journal of Commerce Group, "Key Findings On Terminal Productivity Performance Across Ports, Countries And Regions", July 2013, [http://www.portoflosangeles.org/Board/2013/September%202013/091913\\_Agenda\\_Audit\\_Committee\\_Item\\_3.pdf](http://www.portoflosangeles.org/Board/2013/September%202013/091913_Agenda_Audit_Committee_Item_3.pdf))

**Improving terminal productivity is becoming more urgent**, in large part **because vessels are getting ever larger**. The largest vessel afloat in 1990 could carry 4,800 20-foot-equivalent container units. Today, vessels in the major trade lanes typically carry 8,000 to 13,000 TEUs, and Maersk Line is phasing into service the world's largest container vessels, each with a capacity of 18,000 TEUs. Several carriers told the JOC that terminal productivity in the aggregate has seen little to no improvement over several years. **The rapidly increasing size of mega-ships places tremendous strain on all faces of the marine terminal, making productivity — and the industry's focus on it — all the more important**. Vessel productivity is on the radar screen of shippers for whom terminals can be a major supply chain bottleneck. "This information is extremely valuable," said Jonathan Gold, vice president of supply chain and customs policy at the National Retail Federation. "It is the key factor in getting cargo delivered on time." The JOC Port Productivity data also may be controversial, especially among U.S. port and terminal interests, because it is based on gross container moves per hour with the clock ticking during the entire time the vessel is in port. A terminal's productivity, then, is lower if it doesn't work nights. Berth productivity is a more common measurement in Europe and Asia, where terminals operate round-the-clock with little down time. **"Ports like Hong Kong and Dubai work as close to 24 hours a day as possible,"** said Mark Sisson, senior port planner at AECOM, a marine engineering firm that designs terminals worldwide. **The closer a port comes**

**to 24/7 operations, the higher its berth productivity numbers become** given that it handles large container volumes with little down time for its operations. **Contrast an Asian port — the Far East, especially China, dominates the Port Productivity rankings — with a U.S. port such as Oakland where cargo volumes are much lower. The normal work shift at Oakland is eight hours,** and berth activity ceases for the remaining 16 hours in the day, Sisson said. **That down time gets reflected in**

**Oakland's numbers**. Los Angeles and Long Beach, the two busiest U.S. ports, are ranked highly in berth productivity, as well they should be, because terminals there work two full shifts a day. When necessary, they add a costly, five-hour third shift, with longshoremen being paid for eight hours at a premium overtime rate. Long Beach (along with Elizabeth, N.J.) is the topranked U.S. port and 13th globally, moving an average of 74 containers per hour while a ship is at berth. **Large amounts of down time is why the focus for U.S. ports tends to be on**

**productivity during actual operation**s. Ports in the South Atlantic, for example, prefer to use moves per hour achieved by individual containers versus productivity measured across the full vessel. Charleston and Savannah regularly post crane productivity of 35 to more than 40 moves per crane per hour when the cranes are working, productivity considered at the top of the range within the U.S.

## **AT Trade Competitiveness Adv**

## **Ag Comp Uq -- High Now**

### **Agriculture exports increasing**

#### **Office of the United States Trade Representative 13**

4/1/2013, "Expanding food and agricultural exports: successes in reducing sanitary and phytosanitary barriers"

<http://www.ustr.gov/about-us/press-office/fact-sheets/2013/april/expanding-food-agricultural-exports>

In 2012, **the Obama Administration opened markets for a wide range of food and agricultural products** from across the United States. **The Administration's success in removing** unwarranted sanitary and phytosanitary (SPS) **barriers to U.S. exports is a critical element in expanding new markets for U.S. food and agricultural exports** and is an important milestone under the Administration's National Export Initiative (NEI). **U.S. exporters of food and agricultural products are at the forefront in helping to achieve the goal of doubling U.S. exports by 2014. U.S. food and agricultural exports reached an all-time high in 2012 at over \$145 billion, an increase of \$4 billion over 2011.**

## AT Ports k to Trade

### **Multiple alternative causalities to port inefficiency**

#### **USAID 4**

“THE BROAD ECONOMIC IMPACT OF PORT INEFFICIENCY: A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF TWO PORTS”

[http://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf\\_docs/PNADC612.pdf](http://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/PNADC612.pdf)

While these studies illustrate the effect of transport on trade flow patterns and the importance of transport costs to trade success, some use distance as a proxy for transport costs in their analysis. **High transport costs**, however, **can be explained by many other factors, such as lower cargo volumes, trade flow imbalances, inadequate infrastructure, onerous border and cargo processing procedures, and port inefficiencies.**

Port costs, for example, represent about 8–12 percent of total transport costs from product origin to destination.

Shippers, who consider port costs as one of the very few, if not the only, controllable costs in the logistics chain, make shipping decisions in part based on those costs. To the extent that port costs are a proxy for port performance (efficiency), then port performance influences shippers’ choice of markets.

### **Alt causes to inefficiencies**

Peter **Leach**, writer for JOC, “Locked in for Growth” Feb 1, 2010 [http://www.joc.com/maritime-news/locked-growth\\_20100201.html](http://www.joc.com/maritime-news/locked-growth_20100201.html)

“When cargo starts popping again like it did in 2006 and 2007, **you’re still going to have the same issues at West Coast ports,” said Roy Schleicher, senior director of trade development and global marketing at the Jacksonville Port Authority.** “You’re still going to have **congestion**, you’re still going to have ships anchored and you still may have **labor issues, and you’re still going to have the lack of railcars** and things like that.”

## AT Dredging k to Trade

### **Dredging won't bring expected trade**

**Gibson, 6/22/14** (William E. Gibson, the Sun-Sentinel's Washington bureau chief for 25 years, has covered six presidential elections and 13 sessions of Congress, always with South Florida readers in mind. Along the way, he studied journalism at the University of Kansas and Columbia University.) [http://articles.sun-sentinel.com/2014-06-22/news/fl-port-expansion-payoff-questioned-20140620\\_1\\_port-canaveral-port-everglades-panama-canal](http://articles.sun-sentinel.com/2014-06-22/news/fl-port-expansion-payoff-questioned-20140620_1_port-canaveral-port-everglades-panama-canal)  
WASHINGTON — The much-ballyhooed expansions of Florida seaports might not bring the bonanza their promoters are promising, some [trade](#) experts say. **Ports in Florida and along the East Coast are racing to dredge their harbors deeply enough to attract super-sized ships expected to pass through a widened Panama Canal. The dredging projects, most at taxpayer expense, are expected to set off a wave of jobs and economic benefits that will ripple across Florida, home to 15 deepwater seaports. But some economists predict that at least a few ports are bound to bring disappointment and may not generate enough payoff to justify the investment. They say sending electronics and some other goods across the country by rail or truck will get them to consumers faster than shipping them** through the Panama Canal. The outcome of a competition for shipping will be especially significant at Port Everglades, which has been eager to expand for 17 years, and to a lesser degree at the Port of Palm Beach, which expects to get a spillover of increased traffic to Florida ports. Port Canaveral, already benefiting from expanded cruise line service, hopes to become a bigger economic hub to help Central Florida recover from the loss of jobs along the Space Coast. All three are planning to dredge deeper with help from Uncle Sam, though hurdles remain at the South Florida ports. **"All of the East Coast ports are gearing up with the expectation that they are going to see the arrival of behemoth vessels steaming into port and that they will become the gateway for maritime trade," said Jock O'Connell, trade adviser for Beacon Economics, a Los Angeles-based consulting firm.** **"But there will be winners and losers,"** said O'Connell, one of the world's leading experts on sea trade. **"This will shake out over time. It's likely that not all these ports will be satisfied with the volume of traffic they will be seeing in the next five, 10 or 20 years."**

### **The east coast has already invested and there is no guarantee that people will use ports**

Peter **Leach**, writer for JOC, "Locked in for Growth" Feb 1, 2010 [http://www.joc.com/maritime-news/locked-growth\\_20100201.html](http://www.joc.com/maritime-news/locked-growth_20100201.html)

**Since the Panama Canal Authority announced plans in 2006 for a third set of locks that can handle ships twice as big as the current locks, the industry has been girding for the potential shift of trans-Pacific shipments to the U.S. East Coast. East Coast ports have spent billions of dollars to dredge channels deep enough to accommodate the big new ships** capable of handling up to 12,500 TEUs that will transit the canal when the new locks open, expected in 2014. **Ports and private terminal operators are rushing to expand capacity. But importers of goods from Asia probably will wait before switching to all-water services to see if the bigger ships can offer large enough advantages over the mini-landbridge route from West Coast ports to the Midwest.**

## AT Competitiveness Theory

**Their impact misunderstands trade – when other countries surpass US innovation efficiency in one area, it gives us comparative advantage in other areas – positive gains from trade are inevitable**

### **McCloskey 92**

(Dierdre, Prof of Economics @ University of Illinois-Chicago, “Competitiveness and the Antieconomics of Decline”, in McCloskey ed. *Second Thoughts: Myths and Morals of U.S. Economic History*, pgs. 169-170)

The American story as it is told in the lecture rooms repeats the British story, eerily, but it is a matter of false rhetoric from the start. British observers in the early nineteenth century, like Americans in the Jazz Age, were startled at the ease with which the country had taken industrial leadership. Britain was the first, but a few of its intellectuals were nervously aware of the strangeness of a small island running the world. In 1840, early in British success, J.D. **Hume warned** a select committee of Parliament that **tariffs** on imports of wheat **would encourage other countries** to move away from agriculture towards industry themselves, **breaking Britain’s monopoly of world manufacturing**:

“**[W]e place ourselves at the risk of being surpassed by the manufactures of other countries**: and...I can hardly doubt that **[when that day arrives] the prosperity of this country will recede faster** than it has gone forward.”

**Nonsense. It is** the **“competitiveness” rhetoric, and it has always been nonsense**, in the 1840s or the 1990s. **Britain was made better off by the industrialization of the rest of the world, in the same way that you would be made better off by moving to a neighborhood of more skilled and healthy people.** British growth continued from 1840 to the present, making Britons richer and richer. Likewise, **Americans are made better off when Japan “defeats us” at carmaking because we then go do something we are comparatively good at**—banking, say, or growing soybeans—and let the Japanese do the consumer electronics. **Richer and richer.** According to Maddison, **Britian is about three-and-a-half times richer than it was a century ago; America about five times richer.**

**It is true that Britain and America have grown slower than some other countries**, probably **because Britain and American started richer**. **The story of industrial growth in the past century has been a story of convergence to British and American standards of excellence.** Germans in 1900 earned about half of what Britons earned; now they are about the same. It is not a “race” that Britain lost. **The falling British share of world markets was no index of “failure,” any more than a father would view his falling share of the poundage in the house relative to his growing children as a “failure.”** It was an index of maturity. **This was also true for America. It is good, not bad, that other nations are achieving American standards of competence** in running supermakers and making food processing equipment. Three cheers for foreign “competition.”

### **No impact – Innovation and competitiveness args misunderstand economy**

#### **Bhidé, 2009**

Amar Bhidé, Glaubinger Professor of Business at Columbia University, Winter 2009, “The Venturesome Economy: How Innovation Sustains Prosperity in a More Connected World,” *Journal of Applied Corporate Finance*, Vol. 2, No. 1

Any catch-up, even if it takes place gradually and in the normal course of development, will to some degree reduce the U.S. “lead.” Furthermore, the global influence of techno-nationalism could accelerate this process. As alarmists in the United States don’t fail to remind us, governments in “emerging” countries such as China and India—also in the thrall of techno-nationalist thinking—are making a determined effort to leap ahead in cutting-edge science and technology. I am skeptical that these efforts are going to do any more good for China’s and India’s economy than did similar efforts in Europe and Japan in the 1970s and 1980s.<sup>11</sup> But put aside the issue of whether investing in

cutting-edge research represents a good use of Chinese and Indian resources; does whatever erosion of U.S. primacy in developing high-level know-how that this might cause really threaten U.S. prosperity? Should the U.S. government respond in kind by putting even more money into research? Princeton economist Paul Krugman, in a 1994 Foreign Affairs essay, decried a “dangerous obsession” with “national **competitiveness**.” The tendency to think that “the United States and Japan are competitors in the same sense that Coca-Cola competes with Pepsi,” Krugman pointed out, is widespread; he quoted President Clinton’s claim that “each nation is like a big corporation competing in the global marketplace.” This premise, which is at the heart of techno-nationalism, Krugman persuasively argues, **is** “flatly, **completely** and demonstrably **wrong**.”<sup>12</sup> Although “competitive problems could arise in principle, as a practical, empirical matter, **the major nations of the world are not** to any significant degree **in economic competition with each other**.”<sup>13</sup> The techno-nationalist claim that U.S. prosperity requires that the country “maintain its scientific and technological lead” is particularly dubious: the argument fails to recognize that the **development of scientific knowledge or cutting-edge technology is not a zero-sum competition**. **The results of scientific research are available at no charge to anyone anywhere in the world**. Most arguments for the public funding of scientific research are in fact based on the unwillingness of private investors to undertake research that cannot yield a profit. Cutting-edge technology (as opposed to scientific research) has commercial value because it can be patented; but **patent owners** generally **don’t charge higher fees to foreign licensors**. The then tiny Japanese company Sony was one of the first licensors of Bell Labs’ transistor patent. It paid \$50,000 for a license (after obtaining special permission from the Japanese Ministry of Finance) that started it on the road to becoming a household name in consumer electronics. If patent holders choose to exploit their invention on their own (i.e., not grant licenses to anyone), this does not mean that the country of origin secures most of the benefit at the expense of other countries. Suppose IBM chooses to exploit internally, rather than freely license, a breakthrough from its China Research Laboratory (employing 150 research staff in Beijing). This does not help China and hurt everyone else. Rather, as I discuss at length later in this book, the benefits go to IBM’s stockholders, to employees who make or market the product that embodies the invention, and—above all—to customers, who secure the lion’s share of the benefit from most innovations. These **stockholders, employees, and customers**, who number in the tens of millions, **are located all over the world**. In a world where breakthrough ideas easily cross national borders, **the origin of ideas is inconsequential**. Contrary to Thomas Friedman’s assertion, it does not matter that Google’s search algorithm was invented in California. After all, a Briton invented the protocols of the World Wide Web—in a lab in Switzerland. A Swede and a Dane in Tallinn, Estonia, started Skype, the leading provider of peer-to-peer Internet telephony. How did the foreign origins of these innovations harm the U.S. economy?



## AT Competitiveness k to Heg

### Competitiveness not key to heg

#### Salam, 2009

Reihan Salam, fellow @ the New America Foundation, January 21, pg.

<http://www.theamericanscene.com/2009/01/21/robert-pape-is-overheated>

**Pape spends a lot of time demonstrating that U.S. economic output represents a declining share of global output**, which is hardly a surprise. Yet **as Pape surely understands, the more relevant question is how much and how readily can economic output be translated into military power? The European Union**, for example, **has many state-like features, yet it doesn't have the advantages of a traditional state when it comes to raising an army**. The Indian economy is taxed in a highly uneven manner, and much of the economy is black — the same is true across the developing world. As for China, both the shape of the economy, as Yasheng Huang suggests, and its long frontiers, as Andrew Nathan has long argued, pose serious barriers to translating potential power into effective power. (Wohlforth and Brooks give Stephen Walt's balance-of-threat its due.) So while this hardly obviates the broader point that relative American economic power is eroding — that was the whole idea of America's postwar grand strategy — it is worth keeping in mind. This is part of the reason why **sclerotic, statist economies can punch above their weight militarily, at least for a time — they are "better" at marshaling resources**. Over the long run, the Singapores will beat the Soviets. But in the long run, we're all dead. And given that this literature is rooted in the bogey of long-term coalition warfare, you can see why the unipolarity argument holds water.

## AT Heg Solves War

**Doesn't lead to peace—statistics show it actually leads to war**

**Montiero 12--Assistant Professor of Political Science at Yale University**

Nuno, Unrest Assured, International Security, Vol. 36, No. 3 (Winter 2011/12),

[http://belfercenter.ksg.harvard.edu/files/Unrest\\_Assured.pdf](http://belfercenter.ksg.harvard.edu/files/Unrest_Assured.pdf)

**How well, then, does the argument that unipolar systems are peaceful account for the first two decades of unipolarity since the end of the Cold War? Table 1 presents a list of great powers divided into three periods: 1816 to 1945, multipolarity; 1946 to 1989, bipolarity; and since 1990, unipolarity. 46 Table 2 presents summary data about the incidence of war during each of these periods. Unipolarity is the most conflict prone of all the systems, according to at least two important criteria: the percentage of years that great powers spend at war and the incidence of war involving great powers. In multipolarity, 18 percent of great power years were spent at war. In bipolarity, the ratio is 16 percent. In unipolarity, however, a remarkable 59 percent of great power years until now were spent at war. This is by far the highest percentage in all three systems. Furthermore, during periods of multipolarity and bipolarity, the probability that war involving a great power would break out in any given year was, respectively, 4.2 percent and 3.4 percent. Under unipolarity, it is 18.2 percent—or more than four times higher. 47 These figures provide no evidence that unipolarity is peaceful.48**

## AT Heg - Decline Inevitable

**Decline is inevitable—rise of the rest**

**Kupchan 2/6--professor of international affairs at Georgetown University**

2k12, Charles, Sorry, Mitt: It Won't Be an American Century,

[http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2012/02/06/it\\_won\\_t\\_be\\_an\\_american\\_century?page=0,0](http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2012/02/06/it_won_t_be_an_american_century?page=0,0)

**Even if Romney's rhetoric were to get more domestic traction, it would still bear no resemblance to the new global landscape that is fast emerging.** The United States is indeed an exceptional nation -- **in its prized geographic location, commitment to freedom and democracy, and brand of international leadership.** But the country's exceptionalism should not be used as an excuse to hide from global realities. China's GDP will catch up with America's over the course of the next decade. The World Bank predicts that the dollar, euro, and China's renminbi will become co-equals in a "multi-currency" monetary system by 2025. **Goldman Sachs expects the collective GDP of the top four developing countries -- Brazil, China, India, and Russia -- to match that of the G-7 countries by 2032.** The United States will no doubt exit the current slump and bounce back economically in the years ahead. Nonetheless, a more level global playing field is inevitable.

## AT Heg - Peaceful Transition

### **Peaceful transition – in context of Obama**

**Quinn 11** – Professor of Political Science and Int'l Studies

Adam, "The art of declining politely: Obama's prudent presidency and the waning of American power," International Affairs, Volume 87, Issue 4, Wiley Online

**As noted in the opening passages of this article, the narratives of America's decline and Obama's restraint are distinct but also crucially connected. Facing this incipient period of decline, America's leaders may walk one of two paths. Either the nation can come to terms with the reality of the process that is under way and seek to finesse it in the smoothest way possible. Or it can 'rage against the dying of the light', refusing to accept the waning of its primacy. President Obama's approach, defined by restraint and awareness of limits, makes him ideologically and temperamentally well suited to the former course in a way that, to cite one example, his predecessor was not. He is, in short, a good president to inaugurate an era of managed decline. Those who vocally demand that the President act more boldly are not merely criticizing him; in suggesting that he is 'weak' and that a 'tougher' policy is needed, they implicitly suppose that the resources will be available to support such a course. In doing so they set their faces against the reality of the coming American decline. 97 If the United States can embrace the spirit of managed decline, then this will clear the way for a judicious retrenchment, trimming ambitions in line with the fact that the nation can no longer act on the global stage with the wide latitude once afforded by its superior power. As part of such a project, it can, as those who seek to qualify the decline thesis have suggested, use the significant resources still at its disposal to smooth the edges of its loss of relative power, preserving influence to the maximum extent possible through whatever legacy of norms and institutions is bequeathed by its primacy. The alternative course involves the initiation or escalation of conflictual scenarios for which the United States increasingly lacks the resources to cater: provocation of a military conclusion to the impasse with Iran; deliberate escalation of strategic rivalry with China in East Asia; commitment to continuing the campaign in Afghanistan for another decade; a costly effort to consistently apply principles of military interventionism, regime change and democracy promotion in response to events in North Africa. President Obama does not by any means represent a radical break with the traditions of American foreign policy in the modern era. Examination of his major foreign policy pronouncements reveals that he remains within the mainstream of the American discourse on foreign policy. In his Nobel Peace Prize acceptance speech in December 2009 he made it clear, not for the first time, that he is no pacifist, spelling out his view that 'the instruments of war do have a role to play in preserving the peace', and that 'the United States of America has helped underwrite global security for more than six decades with the blood of our citizens and the strength of our arms'. 98 In his Cairo speech in June the same year, even as he sought distance from his predecessor with the proclamation that 'no system of government can or should be imposed by one nation on any other', he also endorsed with only slight qualification the liberal universalist view of civil liberties as transcendent human rights. 'I ... have an unyielding belief that all people yearn for certain things,' he declared. 'The ability to speak your mind and have a say in how you are governed; confidence in the rule of law and the equal administration of justice; government that is transparent and doesn't steal from the people; the freedom to live as you choose. These are not just American ideas.' 99 His Westminster speech repeated these sentiments. Evidently this is not a president who wishes to break signally with the mainstream, either by advocating a radical shrinking of America's military strength as a good in itself or by disavowing liberal universalist global visions, as some genuine dissidents from the prevailing foreign policy discourse would wish. 100 No doubt sensibly, given the likely political reaction at home, it is inconceivable that he would explicitly**

declare his strategy to be one of managed American decline. Nevertheless, this is a president who, within the confines of the mainstream, embraces caution and restraint to the greatest extent that one could hope for without an epochal paradigm shift in the intellectual framework of American foreign policy-making. 101 In contemplating the diminished and diminishing weight of the United States upon the scales of global power, it is important not to conflate the question of what will be with that of what we might prefer. It may well be, as critics of the decline thesis sometimes observe, that the prospect of increased global power for a state such as China should not, on reflection, fill any westerner with glee, whatever reservations one may have held regarding US primacy. It is also important not to be unduly deterministic in projecting the consequences of American decline. It may be a process that unfolds gradually and peacefully, resulting in a new order that functions with peace and stability even in the absence of American primacy. Alternatively, it may result in conflict, if the United States clashes with rising powers as it refuses to relinquish the prerogatives of the hegemon, or continues to be drawn into wars with middle powers or on the periphery in spite of its shrinking capacity to afford them. Which outcome occurs will depend on more than the choices of America alone. But the likelihood that the United States can preserve its prosperity and influence and see its hegemony leave a positive legacy rather than go down thrashing its limbs about destructively will be greatly increased if it has political leaders disposed to minimize conflict and consider American power a scarce resource—in short, leaders who can master the art of declining politely. At present it seems it is fortunate enough to have a president who fits the bill.

### **Decline will be peaceful and solves all their offense—only a risk of chain ganging MacDonald and Parent 11—Profs of Political Science @ Williams and Miami**

Paul K. and Joseph M., *Graceful Decline?*, *International Security*, Spring 2k11, Volume 35, Number 4, Muse  
 In short, the United States should be able to reduce its foreign policy commitments in East Asia in the coming decades without inviting Chinese expansionism. Indeed, there is evidence that a policy of retrenchment could reap potential benefits. The drawdown and repositioning of U.S. troops in South Korea, for example, rather than fostering instability, has resulted in an improvement in the occasionally strained relationship between Washington and Seoul.<sup>97</sup> U.S. moderation on Taiwan, rather than encouraging hard-liners in [End Page 42] Beijing, resulted in an improvement in cross-strait relations and reassured U.S. allies that Washington would not inadvertently drag them into a Sino-U.S. conflict.<sup>98</sup> Moreover, Washington's support for the development of multilateral security institutions, rather than harming bilateral alliances, could work to enhance U.S. prestige while embedding China within a more transparent regional order.<sup>99</sup> A policy of gradual retrenchment need not undermine the credibility of U.S. alliance commitments or unleash destabilizing regional security dilemmas. Indeed, even if Beijing harbored revisionist intent, it is unclear that China will have the force projection capabilities necessary to take and hold additional territory.<sup>100</sup> By incrementally shifting burdens to regional allies and multilateral institutions, the United States can strengthen the credibility of its core commitments while accommodating the interests of a rising China. Not least among the benefits of retrenchment is that it helps alleviate an unsustainable financial position. Immense forward deployments will only exacerbate U.S. grand strategic problems and risk unnecessary clashes.<sup>101</sup>

## Alt Causalities to Ag Competitiveness

### **Multiple alt causalities to US agricultural competitiveness -**

#### **A) Lack of value-added food production**

##### **Kagochi 7**

(John Mwangi, A Dissertation Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of Auburn University in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy, "EVALUATING THE COMPETITIVENESS OF US AGRICULTURAL MARKET COMMODITIES",  
[http://etd.auburn.edu/bitstream/handle/10415/1382/KAGOCHI\\_JOHN\\_16.pdf?sequence=1](http://etd.auburn.edu/bitstream/handle/10415/1382/KAGOCHI_JOHN_16.pdf?sequence=1))

**The US traditionally exports primarily bulk commodities with little value added. Although US exports of processed food products have been increasing in recent times, it still lags relative to world trade of these products. The declining market share may be due to the tendency of large US firms to invest in foreign countries** rather than to export (Abbot, Brehal, and Reed, 1995). According to Reed (2000) most large food manufacturers rely more on foreign direct investment (FDI) than exports as their strategy to access foreign markets. In 2000, the FDI sale of US processed food was five times the US exports, \$150 billion versus \$30 billion (Marchant, Manukyan, and Koo, 2002). Leading US multinational food processors are clearly expanding US exports even as they increase investment in foreign food processing facilities. The US food manufacturing firms have been successful in increasing exports due to high labor productivity and capital intensity (Henderson, Voros, and Herschberg, 1996; McDonald and Lee, 1994). Hughes (1992) notes **free trade will increase trade** (imports and exports) **in differentiated food products but also increase competition on international markets from newly industrializing countries**. Given a symbiotic relationship between primary agriculture and processed foods, the strategic policy should aim at coordination between the two sectors rather than specialization in one (Gopinath, Roe, and Shane, 1996).

#### **B) Agricultural commodity policies**

##### **Kagochi 7**

(John Mwangi, A Dissertation Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of Auburn University in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy, "EVALUATING THE COMPETITIVENESS OF US AGRICULTURAL MARKET COMMODITIES",  
[http://etd.auburn.edu/bitstream/handle/10415/1382/KAGOCHI\\_JOHN\\_16.pdf?sequence=1](http://etd.auburn.edu/bitstream/handle/10415/1382/KAGOCHI_JOHN_16.pdf?sequence=1))

Tweeten and Pai (1990) note that **US government commodity programs reduce competitiveness by idling resources, artificial production, inefficient mixes of inputs and outputs, and raising costs. Commodity programs may also remove land from production that could produce exports. Policies that subsidize production of raw commodities directly affect prices paid by food processors.** Lowering the price of agricultural commodities leads to lower costs for downstream firms and increases their competitiveness relative to foreign firms (Dohlman, Schnepf, and Bolling, 2003).

## AT Food Scarcity/Food Price Shocks

### **Multiple alt causes - warming, severe weather, drought, rising populations**

#### **Gilbert 12**

Dave Gilbert, CNN, 12-5-2012, How severe weather impacts global food supply,  
<http://www.cnn.com/2012/12/04/world/asia/food-price-impact>

**But 2012's severe weather events around the world have led to low yields in nations such as the U.S. that export grain. Oxfam fears climate change is responsible and that impoverished people could be facing a future of high food prices driven by extreme weather trends.**¶ Oxfam spokesperson Colin Roach said: **"High and volatile food prices spell misery for millions of people like Jaria who face a daily struggle to put food on the table. This is man-made misery in a world which produces enough for everyone to eat."**¶ A recent study commissioned by Oxfam into **global warming and food prices, said: "Against a backdrop of rising populations and changing diets which will see global food production struggle to keep pace with increasing demand, the food security outlook in a future of unchecked climate change is bleak."**¶ Oxfam-commissioned **research on extreme weather and extreme prices**¶ **It has certainly been a tough year for farmers. While much of North America baked in the hottest July on record and the Mid-West suffered its worst drought in 56 years, the UK endured its wettest summer in a century.**¶ **Back in September, CNN reported: "From Ukraine to Yellowstone, in Pakistan and Kazakhstan, the skies have stayed clear, and the earth has been parched. And on the world's commodity exchanges, the prices of corn, soybeans, wheat and tea are surging."**

### **Food shocks are self-correcting**

#### **Kharas 8**

Homi, The Economist Debate: Rising food prices, The Proposition's closing statement,  
[http://www.economist.com/debate/index.cfm?action=article&debate\\_id=10&story\\_id=11829068](http://www.economist.com/debate/index.cfm?action=article&debate_id=10&story_id=11829068)

**Images of food riots and hungry people stir deep emotions. But we must debate trade-offs: will the rise in food prices generate more food for the world and less poverty for poor people in the future? Are today's food prices fair to producers and consumers? Yes, because higher food prices will bring about new investments in agriculture and higher global production. This is already happening in Asia and other parts of the world, and will accelerate over time. Yes, because without higher food prices, land use would shift towards corn-for-ethanol and other biofuel crops and we would have less food available. Yes, because a system with food prices in free fall for 30 years did not produce any measurable decline in hunger and poverty. But the last time food prices were as high as they are today we witnessed the Green Revolution and a rapid reduction of rural poverty in one of the largest population centres of the world, South Asia.**

### **Global markets aren't key- no impact and aff can't solve alt causes**

#### **Paarlberg 8** - Professor of Political Science – Wellesley College

Robert, "It's Not the Price that Causes Hunger", The International Herald Tribune, 4-23, Lexis

**International prices of rice, wheat and corn have risen sharply, setting off violent urban protests in roughly a dozen countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America. But is this a "world food crisis?" It is certainly a troubling instance of price instability in international commodity markets, leading to social unrest among urban food-buyers. But we must be careful not to equate high crop prices with hunger around the world. Most of the world's hungry people do not use international food markets, and most of those who use these markets are not hungry. International food markets, like international markets for everything else, are used primarily by**

the prosperous and secure, not the poor and vulnerable. In world corn markets, the biggest importer by far is Japan. Next comes the European Union. Next comes South Korea. Citizens in these countries are not underfed. In the poor countries of Asia, rice is the most important staple, yet most Asian countries import very little rice. As recently as March, India was keeping imported rice out of the country by imposing a 70 percent duty. Data on the actual incidence of malnutrition reveal that the regions of the world where people are most hungry, in South Asia and Sub-Saharan Africa, are those that depend least on imports from the world market. Hunger is caused in these countries not by high international food prices, but by local conditions, especially rural poverty linked to low productivity in farming. When international prices are high, the disposable income of some import-dependent urban dwellers is squeezed. But most of the actual hunger takes place in the villages and in the countryside, and it persists even when international prices are low. When hunger is measured as a balanced index of calorie deficiency, prevalence of underweight children and mortality rates for children under five, we find that South Asia and sub-Saharan Africa in 2007 had hunger levels two times as high as in the developing countries of East Asia, four times as high as in Latin America, North Africa or the Middle East, and five times as high as in Eastern Europe and Central Asia. The poor in South Asia and sub-Saharan Africa are hungry even though their connections to high-priced international food markets are quite weak. In the poorest developing countries of Asia, where nearly 400 million people are hungry, international grain prices are hardly a factor, since imports supply only 4 percent of total consumption - even when world prices are low. Similarly in sub-Saharan Africa, only about 16 percent of grain supplies have recently been imported, going mostly into the more prosperous cities rather than the impoverished countryside, with part arriving in the form of donated food aid rather than commercial purchases at world prices. The region in Africa that depends on world markets most heavily is North Africa, where 50 percent of grain supplies are imported. Yet food consumption in North Africa is so high (average per capita energy consumption there is about 3,000 calories per day, comparable to most rich countries) that increased import prices may cause economic stress for urban consumers (and perhaps even street demonstrations) but little real hunger. Import dependence is also high in Latin America (50 percent for some countries) but again high world prices will not mean large numbers of hungry people, because per capita GDP in this region is five times higher than in sub-Saharan Africa. There is a severe food crisis among the poor in South Asia and sub-Saharan Africa, but it does not come from high world prices. Even in 2005 in sub-Saharan Africa, a year of low international crop prices, 23 out of 37 countries in the region consumed less than their nutritional requirements. Africa's food crisis grows primarily out of the low productivity, year in and year out, of the 60 percent of all Africans who plant crops and graze animals for a living. The average African smallholder farmer is a woman who has no improved seeds, no nitrogen fertilizers, no irrigation and no veterinary medicine for her animals. Her crop yields are only one third as high as in the developing countries of Asia, and her average income is only \$1 a day.

### **Famine doesn't cause war – it makes people too hungry to fight**

**Barnett 2k** - Australian Research Council fellow and Senior Lecturer in Development Studies @ Melbourne U. School of Social and Environmental Enquiry

Jon, Review of International Studies, "Destabilizing the environment-conflict Thesis", 26:271-288, Cambridge Journals Online

Considerable attention has been paid to the links between population, the environment and conflict. The standard argument is that population growth will overextend the natural resources of the immediate environs, leading to deprivation which, it is assumed, will lead to conflict and instability either directly through competition for scarce resources, or indirectly through the generation of 'environmental refugees'. For example, according to Myers: 'so great are the stresses generated by too many people making too many demands on their natural-resource stocks and their institutional support systems, that the pressures often create first-rate breeding



**grounds for conflict'.<sup>37</sup> The ways in which population growth leads to environmental degradation are reasonably well known. However, the particular ways in which this leads to conflict are difficult to prove. In the absence of proof there is a negative style of argumentation, and there are blanket assertions and abrogations; for example: 'the relationship is rarely causative in a direct fashion', but 'we may surmise that conflict would not arise so readily, nor would it prove so acute, if the associated factor of population growth were occurring at a more manageable rate'.<sup>38</sup> It is possible though, that rather than inducing warfare, overpopulation and famine **reduce the capacity of a people to wage war**. Indeed, it is **less the case** that famines in Africa in recent decades have produced 'first rate breeding grounds for conflict'; the more important, pressing, and avoidable product is widespread malnutrition and large loss of life.**

## Generic Trade Bad

### **Interdependence actually increases war**

Emiel **Awad** October 29, **2013** ERASMUS UNIVERSITY ROTTERDAM faculty of Social Sciences, Master Thesis in International Public Management and Public Policy. "Economic Interdependence, Trade, and War: A Theoretical and Empirical Analysis"

**Some neorealists agree that interdependence could have pacifying effects on interstate relations, but I believe that liberal international economies are structurally unstable so that they have the tendency "to produce periodic collapses of such magnitude as to destabilize the whole pattern of international relations."**<sup>26</sup> **During these periodic collapses, the probability of war increases, as it is hard to quickly adjust.** Due to the division of labor, the structure of **the domestic economy** increasingly **adapts to this division of labor. This adaption means that** the patterns of employment, investment, and production are not fit for a self-sufficient economy. **In a system of interdependence there is no reason for firms to keep their production in a place where it is inefficient. Therefore, these firms will move to other countries.** However, **when these firms produce very valuable and vital goods, ceasing free trade is accompanied with the loss of these goods, at least for a short period of time. It is impossible to start up domestic production again, when the domestic economy has adapted to the interdependent system. When trade breaks down, dependent states lose more than self-reliant states.** Due to this loss in welfare, **the utility of force increases more for dependent than for independent states, as wars may be the only way to survive as a state.**<sup>27</sup> **Independent states are not hurt as much as dependent states. War may be highly necessary for dependent states, as short-run adaption is impossible. Hence, if there is no good alternative for war in the short-run, war becomes a likelier option**

### **Trade causes war**

Emiel **Awad** October 29, **2013** ERASMUS UNIVERSITY ROTTERDAM faculty of Social Sciences, Master Thesis in International Public Management and Public Policy. "Economic Interdependence, Trade, and War: A Theoretical and Empirical Analysis"

Neorealists thin point to the fact that **economic interdependence brings great costs to a state.** In an increasingly interdependent system, **states** increasingly **lose autonomy over their territory.** Additionally, **they depend on access to foreign markets and on foreign sources of raw materials. Due to the fact that economic ties are closely knit, financial crises and other problems in other countries have a greater impact on the own country.**<sup>9</sup> In addition, **economic interdependence means that a state depends on another state. This is very costly, because this means that at any point in time, the future of a state is in the hands of another state. Trade can then be used as a means to coerce a state when interdependence is high.** As neorealists posit that **the ultimate goal of states is survival, dependency should be avoided at all costs.** For this reason, Waltz proposes that **economic interdependence increase the likelihood of war. First, states wish to avoid dependency** (in other words, **they prefer autarky over dependency**),<sup>9</sup> **therefore interdependent relationships are more likely to erupt into conflicts than independent relationships.** Therefore, **when a state has to decide which target he wishes to attack to obtain a given territory, he will choose a state which he depends on strongly. State A has less reason to attack state B if economic dependence is low, as even in the case that the war is won and the territory is captured, autarky is still not reached. It is therefore better to try to capture a territory that state A depends on strongly, as the capture of the territory would lead to an autarkic position. Only in that case is dependency avoided, and the desire for territorial expansion reduced."**

## Trade causes states to go to war even if it hurts their economy

Emiel **Awad** October 29, **2013** ERASMUS UNIVERSITY ROTTERDAM faculty of Social Sciences, Master Thesis in International Public Management and Public Policy. “Economic Interdependence, Trade, and War: A Theoretical and Empirical Analysis”

According to neorealists, **trade and economic interdependence lead to war**. The main thesis of the neorealists is portrayed by the following quote of Kenneth Waltz: “(...) **close interdependence means closeness of contact and raises the prospect of occasional conflict. (...) interdependent states** whose relations remain unregulated **must experience conflict and will occasionally fall into violence. If interdependence grows at a pace that exceeds the development of central control, then interdependence hastens the occasion for war.**” States thus avoid becoming economically dependent, as such **dependency results in great risks**. Especially the last sentence of the quote above shows the central point of neorealism. **If interdependence grows** beyond a state’s control, **then the likelihood of war increases**, as when interdependence grows too swiftly, a state’s future is at stake. **This is especially costly for states, as they ultimately care about their survival** according to Waltz: **Because states are in a self-help system, they try to avoid becoming dependent on others for vital goods and services. The goal of survival must precede any other goal. Economic welfare has no importance when the threat of extinction is present.** Because of this, **economic interdependence is not as important as military goals**. When those vital goods and services are no longer secure, the state faces great difficulties in surviving hence such a situation must be prevented.

## Only bilateral trade decreases conflict, multilateral trade increases conflict

### Jackson and Nei 14

Matthew O. Jackson, professor of economics at Stanford and Stephen Nei member of the dept. of economics at Stanford. “Networks of Military Alliances, Wars, and International Trade” February 2014  
[https://editorialexpress.com/cgi-bin/conference/download.cgi?db\\_name=NASM2014&paper\\_id=368](https://editorialexpress.com/cgi-bin/conference/download.cgi?db_name=NASM2014&paper_id=368)

There are many papers that have investigated the empirical relationship between conflict and trade at a more dyadic level, and as one might expect causation and the specifics of the relationships are difficult to disentangle. Indeed, Barbieri (1996) – investigating the period 1870 to 1938 in Europe and including conflicts that fall substantially short of war – find that **although low to moderate levels of economic interdependence may be accompanied by a decrease in military conflicts; high levels of economic interdependence can be accompanied by increased incidence of conflicts**. This is further nuanced, as Martin et al. (2008) – looking at trade and militarized disputes over the period 1950-2000 – find that an increase in **bilateral trade between two countries correlates with a decreased likelihood of these countries entering military dispute with each other, while an increase in one of the country’s multilateral trade (i.e. an overall increase in a country’s trade share without an increase in the bilateral trade between the two countries) leads to an increased likelihood of war between the pair**. The definition of dispute is broader than that of war and could include posturing for bargaining

## AT No wars post WW2

### **The reasons there have not been wars post world war 2 is not because of trade Jackson and Nei 14**

Matthew O. Jackson, professor of economics at Stanford and Stephen Nei member of the dept. of economics at Stanford. “Networks of Military Alliances, Wars, and International Trade” February 2014

[https://editorialexpress.com/cgi-bin/conference/download.cgi?db\\_name=NASM2014&paper\\_id=368](https://editorialexpress.com/cgi-bin/conference/download.cgi?db_name=NASM2014&paper_id=368)

**These numbers cannot be taken as evidence for the theory. There are many confounding variables in the relationship between trade and wars, so although there was an unprecedented growth in trade post World War II, coincident with an unprecedented drop in the frequency of wars, there was also a cold-war and many technological changes (the advent of nuclear weapons, for instance) as well as an increase in income and wealth levels world-wide, which make it difficult to test the theory directly.**<sup>19</sup> Moreover, **one could also hypothesize that the absence of war led to the increase in trade instead of the reverse.** Thus, **although we do see a strong correlation** that is in line with what our theory would suggest, **there are many confounds which make causation impossible to infer**, and there may be multiple forces at work. Nonetheless, the theory provides one possible explanation.

## AT Trade → Economic Growth

### Trade hurts income equality

#### Rosnick 13

David Rosnick, economist at the Center for Economic Policy Research in Washington D.C. “Gains from trade? The Net Effect of the Trans-Pacific Partnership Agreement on U.S. Wages”. Center for economic and policy research, September 2013. <http://www.cepr.net/documents/publications/TPP-2013-09.pdf>

To start with, this amounts to a rounding error. According to the (PPZ) model results, the U.S. economy will grow 2.4 percent per year between 2015 and 2025 without the TPP. With the TPP, the researchers estimate the economy will grow 2.4 percent per year over the same period. In isolation, the annual one-hundredth of 1 percentage point of growth for 10 years would be better than no additional growth. However, growth is not the only effect of trade agreements. **There are winners and losers from trade, and research has shown that trade contributes to inequality.** In fact, **it would take only a very small contribution to inequality due to trade to wipe out all of the gains that most workers would get from this agreement.** **From 1990 to 2007,<sup>3</sup> wage inequality in the U.S. increased significantly.** As seen in Figure 1, the bottom 90-95 percent of the annual wage distribution grew more slowly than the average wage. Figure 1 does not look at wages below the 25th percentile as many of these workers’ wages will be dictated by the minimum wage and not by trade. **The median (50th) percentile) wage fell 7.6 percent relative to the national average, while the wage at the (top) 99th percentile rose 17.2 percent.** If even 10 percent of the change in inequality was the result of increased trade, and if only 20 percent of increased trade was due to trade agreements, then **the median wage fell** about 0.34 percent on account of trade agreement related inequality – **three times the estimated average gain from** implementing the TPP. Below we make this argument with a little more rigor. From 1990 to 2007 the intensity of **trade** (the amount of trade relative to the economy<sup>4</sup>) increased by an average of 0.4 percentage points per year. The PPZ model results show **intensity of trade increasing by 6 percentage points over 15 years** – exactly the same rate. **Thus,** we might expect **the contribution of trade to inequality to be much the same in the future as in the past.** Previous estimates of the effect of trade on inequality range from 10 to 50 percent of total changes. A more recent estimate based on an OECD analysis is on the lower end of this range – perhaps 15 percent – though it does not include indirect effects such as deunionization. Table 1 describes the basic relationship between inequality and trade intensity. Column 6 shows the percentage change in each wage level (50th percentile, or media; 90th percentile, and 99th percentile) relative to the average wage, over the years 1990-2007. It can be seen **that the median wage fell relative to the average, as did wages up to the 90th percentile; the 99th percentile rose as compared to the mean.** Column 7 divides the percent change in each wage level (50th percentile, or median; 90th percentile, and 99th percentile), relative to the average wage, by the percentage point change in trade intensity. It shows that over the period 1990-2007 the median wage fell by about 1.3 percent relative to the average, for every percentage point increase in trade intensity.

## **AT Coastal Erosion Adv**

## Alt Causalities to Coastal Erosion

### Multiple alt causalities to coastal erosion --

#### A) Human activities - comparatively bigger than climate change

Nicholls et al. 7

(R.J., Professor of Coastal Engineering at the University of Southampton, Additional Authors: P.P. Wong, V.R. Burkett, J.O. Codignotto, J.E. Hay, R.F. McLean, S. Ragoonaden and C.D. Woodroffe, 2007: Coastal systems and low-lying areas. Climate Change 2007: Impacts, Adaptation and Vulnerability. Contribution of Working Group II to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, M.L. Parry, O.F. Canziani, J.P. Palutikof, P.J. van der Linden and C.E. Hanson, Eds., Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 315-356.)

**Few of the world's coastlines are now beyond the influence of human pressures**, although not all coasts are inhabited (Buddemeier et al., 2002). Utilisation of the coast increased dramatically during the 20th century, a trend that seems certain to continue through the 21st century (Section 6.3.1). **Coastal population growth** in many of the world's deltas, barrier islands and estuaries **has led to widespread conversion of natural coastal landscapes to agriculture, aquaculture, silviculture, as well as industrial and residential uses** (Valiela, 2006). It has been estimated that 23% of the world's population lives both within 100 km distance of the coast and <100 m above sea level, and **population densities in coastal regions are about three times higher than the global average** (Small and Nicholls, 2003) (see also Box 6.6). The attractiveness of the coast has resulted in disproportionately rapid expansion of economic activity, settlements, urban centres and tourist resorts. Migration of people to coastal regions is common in both developed and developing nations. Sixty percent of the world's 39 metropolises with a population of over 5 million are located within 100 km of the coast, including 12 of the world's 16 cities with populations greater than 10 million. **Rapid urbanisation has many consequences**: for example, enlargement of natural coastal inlets and dredging of waterways for navigation, port facilities, and pipelines exacerbate saltwater intrusion into surface and ground waters. **Increasing shoreline retreat and risk of flooding of coastal cities in** Thailand (Durongdej, 2001; Saito, 2001), India (Mohanti, 2000), Vietnam (Thanh et al., 2004) and **the United States** (Scavia et al., 2002) **have been attributed to degradation of coastal ecosystems by human activities, illustrating a widespread trend**. **The direct impacts of human activities on the coastal zone have been more significant over the past century than impacts that can be directly attributed to observed climate change** (Scavia et al., 2002; Lotze et al., 2006). **The major direct impacts include drainage of coastal wetlands, deforestation and reclamation, and discharge of sewage**, fertilisers and contaminants into coastal waters. **Extractive activities include sand mining and hydrocarbon production**, harvests of fisheries and other living resources, introductions of invasive species and construction of seawalls and other structures. Engineering structures, such as damming, channelisation and diversions of coastal waterways, harden the coast, change circulation patterns and alter freshwater, sediment and nutrient delivery. Natural systems are often directly or indirectly altered, even by soft engineering solutions, such as beach nourishment and foredune construction (Nordstrom, 2000; Hamm and Stive, 2002). **Ecosystem services on the coast are often disrupted by human activities**. For example, tropical and subtropical mangrove forests and temperate saltmarshes provide goods and services (they accumulate and transform nutrients, attenuate waves and storms, bind sediments and support rich ecological communities), which are reduced by large-scale ecosystem conversion for agriculture, industrial and urban development, and aquaculture (Section 6.4.2).

#### B) Terrestrial influences & Storms - deforestation, sea ice, and invasive species

Nicholls et al. 7

(R.J., Professor of Coastal Engineering at the University of Southampton, Additional Authors: P.P. Wong, V.R. Burkett, J.O. Codignotto, J.E. Hay, R.F. McLean, S. Ragoonaden and C.D. Woodroffe, 2007: Coastal systems and low-lying areas. *Climate Change 2007: Impacts, Adaptation and Vulnerability. Contribution of Working Group II to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*, M.L. Parry, O.F. Canziani, J.P. Palutikof, P.J. van der Linden and C.E. Hanson, Eds., Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 315-356.)

**External terrestrial influences have led to substantial environmental stresses on coastal** and nearshore marine **habitats** (Sahagian, 2000; Saito, 2001; NRC, 2004; Crossland et al., 2005). As a consequence of activities outside the coastal zone, natural ecosystems (particularly within the catchments draining to the coast) have been fragmented and the downstream flow of water, sediment and nutrients has been disrupted (Nilsson et al., 2005; Section 6.4.1.3). **Land-use change, particularly deforestation, and hydrological modifications** have **had downstream impacts**, in addition to localised development on the coast. Erosion in the catchment has increased river sediment load; for example, suspended loads in the Huanghe (Yellow) River have increased 2 to 10 times over the past 2000 years (Jiongxin, 2003). In contrast, damming and channelisation have greatly reduced the supply of sediments to the coast on other rivers through retention of sediment in dams (Syvitski et al., 2005). This effect will likely dominate during the 21st century (Section 6.4.1). **Coasts can be affected by external** **marine influences** (Figure 6.1). **Waves generated by storms over the oceans reach the coast as swell**; there are also more extreme, but infrequent, highenergy swells generated remotely (Vassie et al., 2004). **Tsunamis** are still rarer, but **can be particularly devastating** (Bryant, 2001). **Ocean currents modify coastal environments through their influence on heat transfer**, with both ecological and geomorphological consequences. **Sea ice has physical impacts, and its presence or absence influences whether or not waves reach the coast** (Jaagus, 2006). **Other external influences include** atmospheric inputs, such as dust (Shinn et al., 2000), and **invasive species**.



## AT Climate Change Inevitable

### **Climate change not inevitable - aff authors are all hacks who use inevitability to keep people shoveling coal**

#### **Golden 14**

(KC, policy director of Climate Solutions, which promotes clean and efficient energy sources. He's former director of energy policy for the State of Washington, "Global Warming: The Inevitability Trap", [http://www.huffingtonpost.com/paul-loeb/global-warming-the-inevit\\_b\\_5274788.html](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/paul-loeb/global-warming-the-inevit_b_5274788.html))

It's time to rally around an embattled concept: free will. Having aligned myself against a battalion of seemingly irresistible forces over the years, I've become a student of "inevitability." **How do environmentally destructive choices become inevitable?** Near as I can tell, **it starts when the people who will benefit** from these choices simply **begin to assert their inevitability**. **We're especially receptive to inevitability right now.** **We're comforted by the notion that amid all the uncertainty** and confusion, from the economy to climate disruption -- **some larger forces are at work toward pre-determined outcomes**. We're sort of relieved to hear that something's inevitable, even if it's not necessarily something we like. It clarifies things. It's more pragmatic to be resigned to the inevitable than to chart a new course through the chaos. Plus, it spares us the disappointment of pinning false hopes on dysfunctional democratic institutions--or working to change them. **So the myth of inevitability spreads and the prophecy fulfills itself.** **If the proponents of a particular course can get a critical mass of folks to believe that it's a foregone conclusion, pretty soon it will be.** **Those who assert that conservation and renewables will never replace fossil fuels are using the only strategy available to them.** **They propound the myth of inevitability because they know that few of us would actually choose more waste**, and eternal dependence on coal, oil, and gas extracted in ever-more risky and destructive ways. Having little chance of convincing people that these outcomes are desirable, they tell us we have no choice in the matter. Think about the arguments that have blocked serious U.S. action on climate change. First, it wasn't happening. Then it was happening but it wasn't human-caused. (Damn those sun spots.) Now maybe it is human-caused but there's nothing we can do because China and India's emissions will swamp us anyway--never mind the American corporations whose manufacturing facilities get counted in their carbon impact. So we might as well shovel and ship their coal because otherwise they'll just burn someone else's. Responsibility is no one's. Resistance is futile. But **inevitably we do have choices to make**. Failing to make them consciously isn't failing to make them at all; it's just falling for the inevitability trap. It's just giving ourselves an excuse for allowing the wrong choices to be made, and a feeble excuse at that. Among all the reasons for continuing to choose the path of evading responsibility for climate disruption, I think the least satisfying, the least noble, the hardest one to forgive ourselves for is: "It wasn't up to me." Well, it's up to somebody. Who's it gonna be?

## AT Oil Supply Shocks

**Global spare capacity is huge – zero risk of serious shortages**

**Gholz and Press 8**

(Eugene, Professor of Public Affairs – University of Texas at Austin, and Daryl G., Professor of Government – Dartmouth College, “All the Oil We Need”, The New York Times, 8-21, Lexis)

**WHILE oil prices have declined somewhat of late, the volatility of the market and the political and religious unrest in major oil-producing countries has Americans worrying more than ever about energy security. But they have little to fear -- contrary to common understanding, there are robust stockpiles of oil around the globe that could see us through any foreseeable calamities on the world market. True, trouble for the world's energy supplies could come from many directions. Hurricanes and other natural disasters could suddenly disrupt oil production or transportation. Iran loudly and regularly proclaims that it can block oil exports from the Persian Gulf. The anti-American rhetoric of President Hugo Chavez of Venezuela raises fears of an export cutoff there. And ongoing civil unrest wreaks havoc with Nigeria's output. Even worse, this uncertainty comes in the context of worrisome reports that oil producers have little spare capacity, meaning that they could not quickly ramp up production to compensate for a disruption. But such fears rest on a misunderstanding. The world actually has enormous spare oil capacity. It has simply moved. In the past, major oil producers like Saudi Arabia controlled it. But for years the world's major consumers have bought extra oil to fill their emergency petroleum reserves. Moreover, whereas the world's reserve supply once sat in relatively inaccessible pools, much of it now sits in easily accessible salt caverns and storage tanks. And consumers control the spigots. During a supply disruption, Americans would no longer have to rely on the good will of foreign governments. The United States alone has just more than 700 million barrels of crude oil in its Strategic Petroleum Reserve. Government stockpiles in Europe add nearly another 200 million barrels of crude and more than 200 million barrels of refined products. In Asia, American allies hold another 400 million barrels. And China is creating a reserve that should reach more than 100 million barrels by 2010. Those figures only count the government-controlled stocks. Private inventories fluctuate with market conditions, but American commercial inventories alone include well over a billion barrels. Adding up commercial and government stockpiles, the major consuming countries around the world control more than four billion barrels. Some policy makers and analysts worry that these emergency stocks are too small. For example, they sometimes compare the American strategic reserve to total American consumption, so the reserves appear dangerously inadequate. The United States consumes about 20 million barrels of oil every day, so the Strategic Petroleum Reserve could only supply the country for 35 days. (Furthermore, the United States could not draw oil out of the reserve at anything approaching a rate of 20 million barrels per day.) This is why President Bush in his 2007 State of the Union address called for doubling the strategic reserve. But this vulnerability is a mirage. The size of plausible disruptions, not total consumption, determines the adequacy of global reserves. The worst oil disruptions in history deprived global markets of five million to six million barrels per day. Specifically, the collapse of the Iranian oil industry during the revolution in 1978 cut production by nearly five million barrels a day, and the sanctions on Iraq after its conquest of Kuwait in 1990 eliminated 5.3 million barrels of supply. If a future disruption were as bad as history's worst, American and allied governments' crude oil stocks alone could replace every lost barrel for eight months.**

## AT China-Japan War

### **New Chinese leaders prevent conflict**

**Lam 13** – adjunct professor of history at the Chinese University of Hong Kong and senior fellow at the Jamestown Foundation

Willy, 3-8-13, "Meet China's New Foreign-Policy Team"

[http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2013/03/08/meet\\_china\\_s\\_new\\_foreign\\_policy\\_team?page=0,2](http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2013/03/08/meet_china_s_new_foreign_policy_team?page=0,2)

At least in terms of symbolism and atmospherics, however, the new diplomatic trio could take a more flexible approach to tackling the most worrying flashpoint in Asia: China and Japan's ferocious wrangling over the sovereignty of a group of islets called the Diaoyu in China and the Senkakus in Japan.¶ Given widespread perception within the party leadership that the intensification of the U.S.-Japan defense alliance -- which applies to the Senkakus -- is a centerpiece of Washington's pivot to Asia, the personnel changes in Beijing could also affect the style, if not the substance, of how the party will pursue relations with the United States.¶ Wang's return to the Foreign Ministry after five largely successful years as chief executor of Beijing's Taiwan policy is highly significant. A fluent Japanese speaker, Wang helped break the impasse in Sino-Japanese ties in 2001-2006, when Junichiro Koizumi was prime minister of Japan.¶ Koizumi infuriated the Chinese with provocative actions including annual visits to the Yasukuni Shrine, which honors soldiers killed in World War II, including 14 war criminals. After Koizumi announced in June 2005 his plans to retire, Wang led the Chinese effort to mend fences by conducting secret talks with then Chief Cabinet Secretary Shinzo Abe, the favorite to succeed Koizumi.¶ This discreet diplomacy resulted in Abe's visiting Beijing in October 2006, less than two weeks after he succeeded Koizumi as prime minister (Abe, after a five year break, was re-elected prime minister in December 2012). The visit came despite the ideological affinity between Koizumi and Abe, both of whom favored a more assertive foreign policy as well as the revision of the Japanese Constitution, which would enable Japan to convert its self-defense forces into a regular army.¶ The Chinese Foreign Ministry characterized Abe's 2006 trip as "ice-breaking." Abe allegedly made a private pledge not to visit the shrine while in office, and Beijing offered to focus on economic cooperation, while temporarily setting aside ideological and historical issues, according to diplomatic sources in Tokyo and Beijing.¶ Wang has also successfully helped negotiate the rapprochement over the past few years between the party and its former arch-enemy, the Kuomintang, the ruling party of Taiwan. Known for his charm and finesse, Wang could complement Yang, who has the reputation of a cerebral strategist.¶ By promoting Yang to the post of state councilor in charge of diplomacy, the party leadership may also be sending the signal that it's contemplating a more nuanced posture toward Obama's pivot, which some in the party leadership interpret as a move to contain China. Yang has much more experience with the United States than the outgoing state councilor, Dai Bingguo, who spent most of his career on Russian and East European affairs. Yang cut his diplomatic teeth by serving as interpreter for former President George H.W. Bush, when the latter headed the United States' Beijing Liaison Office (the precursor to the U.S. Embassy) in the mid-1970s. Altogether Yang, a graduate of the London School of Economics, has served three tours in the Chinese Embassy in Washington.¶ Yang enjoys cozy ties with American politicians and in particular, business leaders. He wants to devote more resources to lobbying American multinationals, according to sources close to the diplomatic establishment. These sources also say that Beijing hopes this will persuade the White House to put business before ideology in its China policy. And Cui, who attended Johns Hopkins University while serving in the Chinese delegation to the United Nations in the 1980s, could be a suitable candidate for pursuing this new-look, "people-to-people" diplomacy with the United States.¶ It is important to note, however, that whatever changes in style and orientation the trio's

appointment may portend do not necessarily signal a de-escalation of Beijing's increasingly ferocious saber rattling. The generals appear to overwhelmingly favor bellicosity -- they have enthusiastically echoed Xi's repeated calls over the past two months for China's People's Liberation Army (PLA) to "get ready to fight well and to win wars." Gen. Wei Fenghe, who is commander of China's missile forces, said in February that the PLA must "improve its war-fighting skills" and "it must fulfill the task of winning wars." And recent commentary in People's Liberation Army Daily, a military newspaper, argued that the Chinese military must rid itself of "peacetime inertia and other [bad] habits accumulated over a prolonged period of peace." Popular military commentator Maj. Gen. Luo Yuan, who in April 2012 called for a limited war to "punish" the Philippines for allegedly occupying Chinese territories in the South China Sea, even suggested in a January 2013 interview with Chinese state media that China "must raise its guard against stealthy [military] attacks launched by other countries." Even as diplomats such as Fu Ying, the vice foreign minister in charge of Asia, have reiterated Beijing's commitment to "peaceful development" in global affairs, China has increased the frequency of its "patrol" of the Diaoyu-Senkakus by marine surveillance and other quasi-military vessels.¶ It is too early to say whether the promotion of diplomats with decades of experience in pursuing mutually beneficiary relations with Japan and the United States signals a fundamental change in the Xi administration's pugilistic stance on power projection in the Pacific. Yet at the very least, these personnel changes could indicate that top decision-making bodies are contemplating options other than relentlessly beating the drums of war.

## **No China – Japan war – 7 reasons**

1. China defeat
2. Economic interdependence
3. PLA operational effectiveness
4. Unsettled politics
5. U.S. intervention
6. China military policy
7. China's socialization

## **Moss '13**

Trefor Moss, independent journalist based in Hong Kong. He covers Asian politics, defence and security, and was Asia-Pacific Editor at Jane's Defence Weekly until 2009, 2-10-2013, "7 Reasons China and Japan Won't Go To War" The Diplomat, <http://thediplomat.com/2013/02/10/7-reasons-china-and-japan-wont-go-to-war/>

**Even as tensions between Beijing and Tokyo grow by the day, there are good reasons to believe outright conflict can be avoided.** The sequel seldom improves on the original. Yet Shinzo Abe, Japan's newly re-elected prime minister, has already displayed more conviction during his second spell at the Kantei than in the entire year of his first, unhappy premiership.¶ Political energy is a plus only when it's wisely deployed however, and some fear that Abe is picking a fight he can't win when it comes to his headline stance on China.¶ Rather than attempting to soothe the tensions that built between Beijing and Tokyo in 2012, Abe has struck a combative tone, especially concerning their dispute over the Senkaku/Diaoyu Islands – a keystone for nationalists in both countries. **Each time fighter aircraft are scrambled or ships are sent to survey the likely flashpoint, we hear more warnings about the approach of a war that China and Japan now seem almost eager to wage.** The Economist, for example, recently observed that, "China and Japan are sliding towards war," while Hugh White of the Australian National University warned his readers: "Don't be too surprised if the U.S. and Japan go to war with China [in 2013]." News this week of another reckless act of escalation – Chinese naval vessels twice training their radars on their Japanese counterparts – will only have ratcheted up their concerns.¶ **These doomful predictions came as Abe set out his vision of a more hard-nosed Japan that will no longer be pushed around when it comes to sovereignty issues.** In his December op-ed on Project Syndicate Abe accused Beijing of performing "daily exercises in coercion" and advocated a "democratic security diamond" comprising Australia, India, Japan and the U.S. (rehashing a concept from the 2007 Quadrilateral Security Dialogue). He then proposed defense spending increases – Japan's first in a decade – and strengthened security relations with the Philippines and Vietnam, which both share Tokyo's misgivings about China's intentions. An alliance-affirming trip to the U.S. is expected soon, and there is talk of Japan stationing F-15s on Shimojima, close to the disputed Senkaku/Diaoyu islands.¶ However, **Abe would argue that he is acting to strengthen Japan in order to balance a rising China and prevent a conflict, rather than creating the conditions for one.** And he undoubtedly has a more sanguine view of the future of Sino-Japanese relations than those who see war as an ever more likely outcome. Of course, there is a chance that Chinese and Japanese ships or aircraft will clash as the dispute over the Senkaku/Diaoyu islands rumbles on; and, if they do, there is a chance that a skirmish could snowball unpredictably into a wider conflict.¶ But

if Shinzo Abe is gambling with the region's security, he is at least playing the odds. He is calculating that Japan can pursue a more muscular foreign policy without triggering a catastrophic backlash from China, based on the numerous constraints that shape Chinese actions, as well as the interlocking structure of the globalized environment which the two countries co-inhabit. Specifically, **there are seven reasons to think that war is a very unlikely prospect, even with a more hawkish prime minister running Japan.**

¶ **1. Beijing's nightmare scenario. China might well win a war against Japan, but defeat would also be a very real possibility.** As China closes the book on its "century of humiliation" and looks ahead to prouder times, the prospect of a new, avoidable humiliation at the hands of its most bitter enemy is enough to persuade Beijing to do everything it can to prevent that outcome (the surest way being not to have a war at all). Certainly, China's new leader, Xi Jinping, does not want to go down in history as the man who led China into a disastrous conflict with the Japanese. In that scenario, Xi would be doomed politically, and, as China's angry nationalism turned inward, the Communist Party probably wouldn't survive either.

¶ **2. Economic interdependence.** Win or lose, **a Sino-Japanese war would be disastrous for both participants. The flagging economy** that Abe is trying to breathe life into with a \$117 billion stimulus package **would take a battering as the lucrative China market was closed off to Japanese business. China would suffer, too, as Japanese companies pulled out of a now-hostile market,** depriving up to 5 million Chinese workers of their jobs, even as Xi Jinping looks to double per capita income by 2020. Panic in the globalized economy would further depress both economies, and potentially destroy the programs of both countries' new leaders.

¶ **3. Question marks over the PLA's operational effectiveness.** The People's Liberation Army is rapidly modernizing, but **there are concerns about how effective it would prove if pressed into combat today** – not least within China's own military hierarchy. New Central Military Commission Vice-Chairman Xu Qiliang recently told the PLA Daily that **too many PLA exercises are merely for show,** and that new elite units had to be formed if China wanted to protect its interests. CMC Chairman Xi Jinping has also called on the PLA to improve its readiness for "real combat." Other weaknesses within the PLA, such as endemic corruption, would similarly undermine the leadership's confidence in committing it to a risky war with a peer adversary.

¶ **4. Unsettled politics. China's civil and military leaderships remain in a state of flux,** with the handover initiated in November not yet complete. As the new leaders find their feet and jockey for position amongst themselves, **they will want to avoid big foreign-policy distractions – war with Japan and possibly the U.S. being the biggest of them all.**

¶ **5. The unknown quantity of U.S. intervention.** China has its hawks, such as Dai Xu, who think that the U.S. would never intervene in an Asian conflict on behalf of Japan or any other regional ally. But this view is far too casual. **U.S. involvement is a real enough possibility to give China pause, should the chances of conflict increase.**

¶ **6. China's policy of avoiding military confrontation. China** has always said that it **favors peaceful solutions to disputes,** and its actions have tended to bear this out. In particular, **it continues to usually dispatch unarmed or only lightly armed law enforcement ships to maritime flashpoints,** rather than naval ships. There have been calls for a more aggressive policy in the nationalist media, and from some military figures; but Beijing has not shown much sign of heeding them. The PLA Navy made a more active intervention in the dispute this week when one of its frigates trained its radar on a Japanese naval vessel. This was a dangerous and provocative act of escalation, but once again the Chinese action was kept within bounds that made violence unlikely (albeit, needlessly, more likely than before).

¶ **7. China's socialization.** China has spent too long telling the world that it poses no threat to peace to turn around and fulfill all the China-bashers' prophecies. Already, **China's reputation in Southeast Asia has taken a hit over its handling of territorial disputes there. If it were cast as the guilty party in a conflict with Japan** – which already has the sympathy of many East Asian countries where tensions China are concerned – **China would see regional opinion harden against it further still.**

This is not what Beijing wants: It seeks to influence regional affairs diplomatically from within, and to realize "win-win" opportunities with its international partners. ¶ In light of these constraints, Abe should be able to push back against China – so long as he doesn't go too far. He was of course dealt a rotten hand by his predecessor, Yoshihiko Noda, whose bungled nationalization of the Senkaku/Diaoyu islands triggered last year's plunge in relations. Noda's misjudgments raised the political temperature to the point where neither side feels able to make concessions, at least for now, in an attempt to repair relations. ¶ However, Abe can make the toxic Noda legacy work in his favor. Domestically, he can play the role of the man elected to untangle the wreckage, empowered by his democratic mandate to seek a new normal in Sino-Japanese relations. Chinese assertiveness would be met with a newfound Japanese assertiveness, restoring balance to the relationship. It is also timely for Japan to push back now, while its military is still a match for China's. Five or ten years down the line this may no longer be the case, even if Abe finally grows the stagnant defense budget. ¶ Meanwhile, Abe is also pursuing diplomatic avenues. It was Abe who mended Japan's ties with China after the Koizumi years, and he is now trying to reprise his role as peacemaker, having dispatched his coalition partner, Natsuo Yamaguchi, to Beijing reportedly to convey his desire for a new dialogue. It is hardly surprising, given his daunting domestic laundry list, that Xi Jinping should have responded encouragingly to the Japanese olive branch. ¶ In the end, Abe and Xi are balancing the same equation: They will not give ground on sovereignty issues, but they have no interest in a war – in fact, they must dread it. Even if a small skirmish between Chinese and Japanese ships or aircraft occurs, the leaders will not order additional forces to join the battle unless they are boxed in by a very specific set of circumstances that makes escalation the only face-saving option. The escalatory spiral into all-out war that some envisage once the first shot is fired is certainly not the likeliest outcome, as recurrent skirmishes elsewhere – such as in Kashmir, or along the Thai-Cambodian border – have demonstrated.

## **Solvency**

## **No Solvency - Funding Mismanagement**

### **Funding for port improvements goes mismanaged**

#### **Nagle, 10/31/12**

(Kurt Nagle has over 30 years of experience in Washington, DC, related to seaports and international trade. Since 1995, Mr. Nagle has served as President and Chief Executive Officer for the American Association of Port Authorities (AAPA). Mr. Nagle began working at AAPA, the alliance of the leading public port authorities throughout the Western Hemisphere, in 1985. Prior to joining AAPA, Mr. Nagle was Director of International Trade for the National Coal Association and Assistant Secretary for the Coal Exporters Association. Previously, he worked in the Office of International Economic Research at the U.S. Department of Commerce. Mr. Nagle serves on the Executive Committee of the Propeller Club of the United States and is a former commissioner of PIANC, the International Navigation

Congress.)<http://www.tradeandindustrydev.com/Industry/Logistics,%20Warehousing%20%2526%20Distribution/Improved-freight-connections-america%E2%80%99s-seaports-cr-71>

Although our nation's ports are dynamic, vibrant centers of trade and commerce, they rely on federal and private partnerships. **U.S. seaports and their private-sector business partners anticipate investing more than \$9 billion annually for each of the next five years to maintain and improve their freight- and passenger-handling infrastructure. Unfortunately, the federal government isn't adequately matching this with concomitant investments in connecting land- and water-side infrastructure to effectively handle increasing cargo volumes. This lack of federal foresight causes inefficiencies in moving cargo to and from ports, resulting in time delays, reduced international competitiveness for U.S. exports, and increased prices and product shortages for consumers.** Despite there being a federal Harbor Maintenance Tax on seaport cargo that raises 100 percent of the revenue needed for maintaining America's harbors and channels at their required dimensions, **only about half of that money is being appropriated for its intended purpose, resulting in serious dredging needs being neglected. At the same time, federal funding for constructing deeper navigation channels has all but disappeared, although project sponsors—usually ports—pay between 35 percent and 60 percent of the cost, depending on project depth.**

### **Funds have been mismanaged**

#### **Goldstein 12**

David Goldstein is a staff writer for CBS Los Angeles, "Port of LA spend nearly 200k on a Party"  
([http://www.coburn.senate.gov/public/index.cfm/news?ContentRecord\\_id=5ac96d1f-482b-4c88-b41d-351bca840a85](http://www.coburn.senate.gov/public/index.cfm/news?ContentRecord_id=5ac96d1f-482b-4c88-b41d-351bca840a85))

**While the City of L.A. is laying off workers and cutting back services, we uncovered one city agency spending hundreds of thousands of dollars on a party.** And we obtained the video to prove it. It was like a Hollywood premiere party, complete with a red carpet and **paid with public money**. Port of L.A. Executive Director Geraldine Knatz was the host. If the attendees did not look like stars, they might have felt like them. We found **thousands of dollars spent for dancers, wine to toast the party, and even miniature Oscars. "I'm appalled," said a fisherman, who has been at the port for 18 years and thinks some of the money should have been used for improvements in the harbor — not partying.** "That's one hell of a party. Why weren't we invited? We paid for it," he said. **The Port of L.A. is the busiest port in North America and generates millions of dollars each year. But like every city agency, money is tight. Workers have even had to give back some of their scheduled raises this year. But that did not stop officials from throwing that lavish party. The party was held in Busan, South Korea earlier this year for 450 people.** It came during the International Association of Ports and Harbors convention. The event was called "L.A. Night" to promote the convention coming to L.A. in

2013. We obtained the videotape from the port through the California Public Records Act, along with dozens of pages of receipts revealing a lot more. It apparently was not enough for port officials to just show clips of Hollywood musicals. The port hired dancers dressed in character — and they were not local. Six dancers and an assistant were flown in from Los Angeles. **The cost: \$18,500 just for travel and hotel, \$22,500 for the performance — adding up to a total of \$41,000.** But for that money they were at least around the next day to pose with some of the guests. What's a party without wine? **Almost \$12,000 was spent for 192 bottles, an average of just over \$61 a bottle.** And of course **there were Oscars. The miniatures cost more than \$3,800! The total cost for the party was \$192,000, but that does not include airfare. Knatz flew business class. Her round-trip ticket cost the port more than \$13,000, even though she made \$307,000 last year. That is more than the mayor and more than the governor.** The port is quick to point out that they do not take any taxpayer money from the city, instead generating their own income. But they did accept \$23.5 million in federal taxpayer subsidized stimulus money over the past few years. "How do you justify spending almost \$200,000 on a party," I asked? "It was a professional promotional event," Knatz responded, saying we got it all wrong. "It was not a party. It was a professional promotional event," she said. "It was a party," I asked? "It was a professional promotional event," she responded. It was already a done deal that the convention will be coming to L.A. in 2013 before the party or promotional event or whatever you call it. But Knatz said it was all worth it because she is hoping the convention will generate \$4 million in revenue. "We wanted to give them a little bit of flavor of Los Angeles. It had a Hollywood theme," she said. The expenditures were approved by the Board of Harbor Commissioners. But L.A. City Councilman Dennis Zine wants to know why. "It's absurd, absolutely absurd. Another example of frivolous waste in city government," Zine said. It is money residents around the port say should be used to better serve the people, not the partyers.

## Los Angeles isn't the only the example Barna 2012

John Barna is a staff reporter at the Gloucester County Times, "N.J. Comptroller: Delaware River Port Authority wasted, 'mismanaged' millions of tollpayer dollars" ([http://www.nj.com/sunbeam-news/index.ssf/2012/03/nj\\_comptroller\\_delaware\\_river.html](http://www.nj.com/sunbeam-news/index.ssf/2012/03/nj_comptroller_delaware_river.html))

**A decade of mismanagement and political cronyism at the Delaware River Port Authority wasted millions of dollars in toll payers' money, according to a damning report issued Thursday by the New Jersey comptroller, with bridge fares benefiting the likes of South Jersey political boss George Norcross. "In nearly every area we looked at, we found people who treated the DRPA like a personal ATM, from DRPA commissioners to private vendors to community organizations," Comptroller Matthew Boxer said. "People with connections at the DRPA were quick to put their hand out when dealing with the agency, and they generally were not disappointed when they did." The 77-page report — requested in July 2010 by New Jersey Gov. Chris Christie and then Pennsylvania Gov. Ed Rendell — notes that Norcross' insurance agency Conner Strong benefited to the tune of \$410,000 through a fee-splitting agreement. The report chides the agency and its 16-member commission — eight from both New Jersey and Pennsylvania — for the way it distributed \$440 million in "economic development" funds, and alleges that a \$700,000 "community giving fund" largely benefited organizations championed by DRPA commissioners and executives, in particular Chief Executive Officer John Matheussen of Washington Township.** The report also suggests the DRPA held a loose rein on free access to E-ZPass transponders. According to the report: • Insurance broker Willis of New Jersey paid Conner Strong \$410,000 over six years even though Conner Strong did no direct work for the DRPA. Norcross is executive chairman of the Marlton-based Conner Strong — formerly known as Commerce Insurance Services — in addition to being chairman of Cooper University Hospital in Camden. "Willis attributes the payments to Conner Strong's efforts in securing the DRPA business for Willis .... Conner Strong takes the position that the payments to Conner Strong were attributable to general marketing and referral efforts and had nothing to do with the DRPA," the report reads. In 2002, the report alleges, Norcross declined an offer by then New Jersey Gov. James McGreevey to be an insurance broker for the DRPA. "Norcross stated that working for DRPA would be too much of a 'reputational risk,'" the report asserts. Asked to recommend another broker, Norcross told Boxer's staff "he probably would have



recommended Willis.” • The DRPA “established but then failed to abide by detailed application, approval and monitoring policies concerning its economic development projects.” Projects “were brought to the DRPA’s attention by a DRPA commissioner, the governor’s office in New Jersey or Pennsylvania, or by some other state official.” Further, the report claims, “Matheussen did not even know how a project could get evaluated and approved if it came from the general public.” The DRPA was unable to produce an application for a \$3.5 million grant for the President’s House site in Philadelphia as well as a \$3 million grant made in October 2009 for construction and repair of levees and floodgate facilities along the Repaupo Creek in Logan and Greenwich townships — a project championed by state Sen. President Stephen Sweeney, D-West Deptford Township, while he was freeholder director in Gloucester County. “No apologies here, my friend,” Sweeney responded to queries about the award. “The federal government was not helping. We were looking for any sources to protect that levee.” Former DRPA Deputy General Counsel Michael Joyce — who resigned in 2010 amid charges that he abused E-ZPass privileges — told Boxer’s office that when he “questioned the wisdom” of DRPA investing in certain projects, he was “generally admonished by DRPA executive management and commissioners.” In emptying out its economic development fund in December, the DRPA gave \$6 million to Cooper toward a cancer center. • The DRPA’s chair and vice chair had final sign-off rights to a \$700,000 fund to aid social and civic causes. However, said Boxer’s report, “A common thread among organizations receiving multiple donations from the fund and those receiving the largest donations was their connection to DRPA officials.” Former Commissioner Robert Bogel of Pennsylvania “secured 13 payments” totaling \$59,180 for newspaper advertisements in the Philadelphia Tribune though Bogel is president and CEO of the paper and “DRPA did not purchase similar advertisements in any other newspaper.” Such groups as the “Seaman’s Church Institute, the Battleship New Jersey, the World Trade Center of Greater Philadelphia, the Philadelphia Sports Congress, the Philadelphia Convention and Visitors Bureau and the Southern New Jersey Development Council” all received grants. Matheussen was on the boards of directors for those groups, the report says. Pennsylvania Attorney John Estey was chair designee from 2004 to 2009 and chair from 2009 to January 2011 when he was succeeded by Pennsylvania Gov. Tom Corbett. The fund was terminated before Corbett came on board. Camden County Freeholder Jeffrey Nash has been DRPA vice chairman since 2002. • The DRPA lost “more than \$1 million” in revenue over 10 years through free passage benefits provided to DRPA employees and commissioners. A review of E-Z Pass records showed that “DRPA directors, commissioners and former commissioners enrolled individuals such as friends, business associates, in-laws and adult children on their E-ZPass account, which, in turn, provided them with the benefit of unlimited free passage over DRPA bridges.” Also, the DRPA’s E-ZPass vendor by mistake gave 53 “random individual” **free passage privileges, resulting in a loss of \$4,569 in revenue before the error was noticed**. Boxer, in a telephone interview, called the report “a pretty good top-to-bottom review. We looked at a lot of issues. It was done in an in-depth way.” The report says “more than 50 current and former DRPA employees and commissioners as well as other individuals” were interviewed by Boxer’s staff. He acknowledged “to the DRPA’s credit,” a “number of deficiencies identified” in the report have been corrected or are in the process of being corrected. A statement by DRPA Corporate Communications Manager Tim Ireland noted the agency has eliminated its Social and Civic sponsorship fund as well as any role in economic development projects in the region. The DRPA, Ireland said, is “instituting a fixed-fee” model for its insurance brokers “that does not include percentage-based brokerage commissions.” Further, the statement reads, the only DRPA employees who receive free E-ZPass privileges are those who won them via “formal arbitration award.” “We take the concerns expressed by the OSC very seriously, and we will be taking steps to evaluate and address recommendations in the report as promptly as possible,” the statement reads. “As soon as Gov. Christie took office, he zeroed in on the DRPA as among the worst offenders in terms of abusing tollpayer money for employee and commissioner perks and large-scale spending outside the agency’s core mission,” read a statement from the governor’s press secretary, Michael Drewniak. At least two DRPA executives — neither of whom would go on the record — observed that Boxer once chaired the Governor’s Authorities Unit. That unit has a representative at each and every meeting of the DRPA commission, with the state billing the agency \$17,000 a year for expenses. In response, Boxer replied “To put it on the governors is a bit of a stretch.” “So much of what is discussed in the report never came to the board for action,” Boxer added. He noted the arrangement with Willis and Conner Strong, as well as a “true-up payment” where the brokers representing both Pennsylvania and New Jersey divided commissions, “did not come before the board for action” as examples of DRPA actions that were “hidden” from public view. A statement from Conner Strong and Buckelew said the agency “respectively disagrees” with Boxer’s “observation that the DRPA lost the opportunity for savings years ago by negotiating insurance commissions. Specifically, New Jersey law and regulations did not, and do not, permit the DRPA to negotiate lower commissions with its insurance brokers. As a result, any payment to Commerce by Willis — regardless of the purpose — had zero impact on the DRPA’s commission rates or amounts. Furthermore, Commerce and Willis had a marketing agreement, not a commission agreement.” Boxer’s report included an interview with Mary Rita D’Alessandro, who was Estey’s

assistant beginning in 2008. When she questioned the “true-up” split with the brokers, she said, she was told “ ‘You don’t want to get in the middle of this,’ like I was dealing with the f\*\*\*ing mob or somethin’.” **in reaction to the report, U.S. Sen. Frank Lautenberg, D-N.J., said “The residents of South Jersey deserve better.” Lautenberg suggested the allegations levied against the DRPA are “yet another example of how a corrupt political machine operates to enrich itself and local politicians at the expense of everyday people.”** Norcross responded by saying, “Sen. Lautenberg has been picking the pockets of no-bid, pay-to-play vendors at the DRPA and other public agencies throughout New Jersey for decades. Aside from the absurdity of his comments, it’s interesting to note that he never expressed these sentiments when he literally begged for South Jersey’s support in all of his campaigns for reelection. It’s the height of hypocrisy.

## **Inherency**

## No Inherency

### **Savannah Plan Already Passed**

#### **Bluestein 6-10-14**

Atlanta Journal-Constitution, “Democrats heave sigh of relief as Savannah Port dredging draws near” (<http://politics.blog.ajc.com/2014/06/10/democrats-heave-sigh-of-relief-as-savannah-port-dredging-draws-near/>)

**President Barack Obama this morning signed HR 3080 into law, clearing the last legislative hurdle to deepen Savannah’s harbor and waterway from 42 feet to 47 feet. The project has been in the works for more than a decade and seemed a certainty when Vice President Joe Biden visited Savannah last year and proclaimed it would happen “come hell or high water.”**

Things got a little soggy in March, though, when the Obama Administration stunned many here by declaring the project not yet ready to go. Georgia leaders scrambled to make sure the project was on track, while the top Democrats on the ballot struggled to explain the seeming change of heart.

At the time, Jason Carter, who is challenging Gov. Nathan Deal, said the Republican incumbent’s “stick in the eye” approach to the White House may have hurt Georgia. And Michelle Nunn, the Democratic nominee for an open Senate seat, was pressed to explain her appearance with Biden at a fundraising event shortly before the administration’s move.

Republicans quickly ratcheted up the pressure on the White House, saying they simply wanted Obama to live up to his promise. Deal’s administration quietly explored options to float the full cost of the project with the hope of getting reimbursed by the federal government later.

Federal lawmakers, though, were able to hammer out an agreement last month, and Obama signed it into law with a brief ceremony this morning.

That led Carter’s campaign sent out a statement declaring that “cooler heads prevailed” and thank federal lawmakers for working across party lines to secure the deal.

**“Our Congressional representatives did great work breaking through the partisan gridlock in Washington to hold the federal government accountable to its commitment to Georgia,”** said Carter, who said other leaders had a “knee-jerk reaction” that could have threatened the project.

Nunn’s reaction echoed her post-partisan pitch. She painted the delays as part of a broader dysfunction and expressed hope that Washington doesn’t put any more roadblocks in the way.

“The fact that it took more than a decade to approve what everyone considers an essential project for our state and the future of our economy is an embarrassing testament to our broken political process,” she said.

**Atlanta Mayor Kasim Reed, one of the key money-chasers for this project, said the deepening would help position Atlanta as the “logistics hub of the Western Hemisphere.”** And Deal’s camp said that Georgia will be ready to begin work by the year’s end because of proactive leadership while others were advocating a “wait-and-see approach.”

“We’re all celebrating today,” said his office. “Now it’s time to get to the real work.”

**It’s easy to see why the deepening has galvanized both parties like few other issues** in Georgia. It’s widely acknowledged as Georgia’s single most crucial economic development project, and it’s aimed at helping the bustling port handle the larger ships that could soon be calling on the port after the Panama Canal’s widening is finished next year. There’s another politician who is particularly happy with today’s signing. Rep. Jack Kingston of Savannah is locked in a bitter runoff for the GOP Senate nomination against businessman David Perdue, who is waging an anti-incumbent outsider campaign. For Kingston, who sent out a release with a reminder that he’s been pushing the dredging since 1999, today’s signing provides a counterpoint: It takes insider contacts with key Washington figures to pull off a deal like this one.

## Major bills passed through the house- money already spent

**Wallbank, 14,**Derek Wallbank, Staff Writer from the Bloomberg Magazine, “House Passes Port-Dredging Bill Boosting Maersk to Nucor”, <http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2014-05-20/house-passes-port-dredging-bill-boosting-maersk-to-nucor.html>

**The U.S. House passed a \$12.3 billion water-projects bill that lawmakers said would boost dredging to accommodate larger ships** built to transit the expanding Panama Canal. **The measure, passed 412-4, would be the first water infrastructure bill enacted since 2007. It would authorize 34 projects including dredging, flood control, hurricane recovery and environmental restoration. The Water Resources Reform and Development Act, H.R. 3080, would revamp the way major U.S. shipping projects are funded. The bill would allow ports to pay the cost of deepening harbors up front and then seek reimbursement from the government once a project is authorized by lawmakers.** That could help facilities such as Port Everglades in **South Florida** reduce construction time by years. “It is a jobs bill,” **House Transportation** and Infrastructure Chairman Bill Shuster told reporters. **In addition to construction jobs, the Pennsylvania Republican said, “when America invests in its infrastructure and keeps us competitive, that means our industry and business can be competitive and add jobs on the factory floor.”** The measure would expand the number of U.S. ports that can handle super freighters built by Maersk Inc. and Mediterranean Shipping Co. to take advantage of the expanding Panama Canal. Expanded capacity would reduce shipping costs for exporters including Caterpillar Inc. and Cargill Inc. ‘No’ Votes **All four House lawmakers voting against the measure were** Republicans: **Justin Amash** of Michigan, **Louie Gohmert** of Texas, **Tim Huelskamp of Kansas** and **Matt Salmon of Arizona**. The bill was the subject of a lobbying campaign that industry groups said they want to make a model for future infrastructure bills. Shipping industry groups targeted Tea Party lawmakers by stressing the role of interstate commerce in the Constitution, and emphasizing quotes from founding fathers such as **George Washington** backing the construction of canals. Senate Majority Leader **Harry Reid**, a Nevada Democrat, has said the Senate will act on the compromise bill this week. By far the biggest spending project authorized in the measure is \$6.7 billion for a Louisiana levee system called Morganza to the Gulf. Other flood-prevention projects in the bill are a diversion channel for the Red River of the North near Fargo, **North Dakota**, and Moorhead, **Minnesota**, as well as levees in the Natomas Basin in **Sacramento**, California. The largest navigation project would deepen the Sabine-Neches Waterway, which connects the oil-refining hub of Beaumont and **Port Arthur**, Texas, with the **Gulf of Mexico**. **Keystone Pipeline** The Port Arthur area is home to the southern end of the Keystone XL pipeline. Deepening the port would reduce shipping costs for oil and natural gas processed there by **Exxon Mobil Corp. (XOM)**, Total SA and **Cheniere Energy Inc. (LNG)** Paul Beard, chairman of the Sabine Neches Navigation District, said he was “thrilled” by the project’s inclusion. The navigation district, which oversees the waterway on the Texas-Louisiana border, projects the channel deepening to boost business activity by \$5 billion. The measure also would speed environmental reviews of infrastructure plans, capping review time at three years. **Farm Bureau** The **American Farm Bureau Federation** urged Congress to pass the bill. Farmers “depend on an efficient and reliable inland waterway system linked to competitive ports,” bureau President Bob Stallman said in a statement today. Environmental groups objected to the limit on review time, and the measure drew opposition from small-government groups including Heritage Action. “It hikes spending while doing little to reduce bureaucracy and limit the role of the federal government,” Heritage Action spokesman Dan Holler said in an e-mail urging lawmakers to vote against the bill. Shuster and **House Speaker John Boehner, an Ohio Republican, said the measure was a success for those who want to trim government.** The bill was crafted without earmarks to fund pet projects in lawmakers’ home states, they said. It also would delete \$18 billion in backlogged projects that, while unlikely to get built, were still technically on government ledgers. **It also would create a Water Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Authority, a federal-private financing program for water infrastructure. About \$175 million in subsidies through 2019 may lead to \$1.75 billion in projects, Bloomberg Industries analyst Brian Friel said. Project Financing** JPMorgan Chase & Co. led U.S. **project financing** for the year to date, underwriting \$89 billion in projects through May 20, according to a Bloomberg compilation of data. JPMorgan was followed by Bank of America Corp., Goldman Sachs Group Inc. and Citigroup Inc. The measure would encourage the use of U.S.-made iron and steel products that could increase demand for products manufactured by Nucor Corp. and United States Steel Corp., Bloomberg analysts Friel and Brad Barker said.

## **Plan Already passed in Louisiana Office of Senator Mary Landrieu 6-10-14**

“President Signs Water Bill That Deepens Port of Iberia Channel, Includes SW La. Priorities First time in 14 years a President has signed water bill, Landrieu overrode Bush’s 2007 veto”

([http://www.landrieu.senate.gov/?p=press\\_release&id=4469](http://www.landrieu.senate.gov/?p=press_release&id=4469))

**WASHINGTON – U.S. Senator Mary L. Landrieu, D-La., today attended the signing of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act (WRRDA) at the White House and praised the passage of the legislation that includes important Army Corps reforms and critical water infrastructure projects for Southwest Louisiana, including language to allow the deepening of the Port of Iberia channel and Sabine-Neches Waterway, along with increased dredging for the Port of Lake Charles. This is the first time a president has signed a water infrastructure bill in 14 years.** In 2007, Sen. Landrieu led the effort to successfully override President George W. Bush’s veto of the 2007 water bill. It was the first veto override of Bush’s presidency. **The Port of Iberia project’s inclusion comes after months of work by Sen. Landrieu and her Senate colleagues to overcome the ideological opposition of House negotiators that considered the project modification an earmark.** In the fall 2013, after passage of the Senate WRDA bill, the Abbeville Harbor & Terminal District and Vermillion Parish Police Jury passed resolutions in support of the requested revision, but, despite the cost savings, the House failed to include the language in its bill. “The signing of the water infrastructure bill includes a common-sense fix so we can invest federal funds to deepen the Port of Iberia channel. The deeper the channel, the greater the jobs. **Energy ports like the Port of Iberia play a critical role in our nation’s domestic energy production and are integral to both the continued economic growth of Acadiana and our nation’s energy independence,” Sen. Landrieu said.** “To put shovels in the ground and turn dirt, it is going to take dollars. That is why I successfully fought to establish revenue sharing to bring significant additional revenues back to Louisiana in the coming years for water infrastructure projects like the Port of Iberia channel. I hope **today marks the beginning of a new partnership between federal, state and local officials to turn important projects like this into a reality.**” The final WRRDA bill includes many reforms that Sen. Landrieu championed. The bill improves the nation’s ability to operate and maintain Louisiana’s inland waterways by ensuring that money already being collected from industry and navigation is used for its **intended purposes. It allows us to make smart investments in deepening federal channels and upgrading our water infrastructure to stay competitive in the 21st century.** The bill provides a path forward for six Louisiana projects that have been mired in red tape awaiting federal authorization since the last WRDA bill passed in 2007. This is an essential step toward expediting project implementation and reducing bureaucratic delays, but it will add billions in new projects onto the existing \$60 billion Army Corps backlog. Sen. Landrieu also supported language to extend lock operations that have been arbitrarily reduced by the Army Corps of Engineers. There is a provision in this bill that makes it easier for local communities like Calcasieu Parish to contribute funding to maintain or extend service at these facilities to ensure our waterborne commerce, recreational fisheries, and tourism industries are not adversely affected. Louisiana does not have the luxury of waiting years for the Army Corps to study and re-study these essential projects. The Senate’s WRRDA bill will streamline studies, coordinate agency reviews, and make local parishes and levee districts true partners in the process. It also adds much needed flexibility to the mitigation program and improves its ability to support ecosystem restoration efforts, and other priority projects in the Louisiana’s Coastal Master Plan.

## **USFG already spending money on even the most minute of ports Dredging Today, June 26 2014**

“Dredging Included in Redwood City Port 2014-2015 Budget”

(<http://www.dredgingtoday.com/2014/06/26/dredging-included-in-redwood-city-port-2014-2015-budget/>)

**The Redwood City Port Commission has approved its fiscal year 2014-2015 budget, projecting operating revenues at \$6,627,720 and operating expenses at \$4,281,890. Operating income of \$2.3 million is offset by \$660,000 in net non-operating expenses,** primarily due to the interest expense on the

Port's 1999 and 2012 revenue bonds. Subvention of \$398,000 to the City of Redwood City is included in the budget, resulting in a projected net income after subvention of \$1.3 million. The FY15 Budget includes \$2.9 million for capital projects. **The major projects are "F" dock Marina dredging at an estimated cost of \$600,000 and public access improvements between the Seaport Conference Center and the fishing pier estimated at a cost of \$500,000. There will be another installment for the Port's cost share of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Channel Deepening and Improvement Study of \$800,000. Port Executive Director Michael J. Giari said that the FY15 budget is based on an estimated 1,713,000 metric tons of cargo, an increase over the FY13 actual tonnage and FY14 tonnage forecast.** The tonnage is primarily composed of construction sand and aggregates imported from Canada and recycled scrap metal exported to Asia. Port Commission Chair Lorianna Kastrop said: **"The growth in tonnage and revenue at the Port will enable us to complete improvements to the waterfront public access areas and guest berthing for recreational and excursion boats. These improvements, estimated to cost approximately \$1 million, will increase the use and enjoyment of the community's waterfront."**

## **Ports are already being dredged at the expense of the government**

**Phillips 14**, Steve Phillips, Senior Reporter at WLOX 2, June 27, 2014,

(<http://www.wlox.com/story/25883031/gulfport-dredging-project-to-begin-in-september>)

**A project to dredge the ship channel at the Port of Gulfport will begin in September. The port authority board on Thursday approved an agreement with the Army Corps of Engineers to proceed. We should see dredging starting sometime in early September. It should be about a four or five month process," said Port Director Jonathan Daniels.** The dredging project is channel maintenance, returning the channel to its authorized depth of 36 feet. "With what goes on with many of our current tenants now, it's awfully tight. This gets us back to our authorized depth of 36 feet and allows us the opportunity to engage in even stronger business development activities," said Director Daniels. **The port authority board agreed to put up \$8 million to jump-start the maintenance dredging, which is a responsibility of the federal government.** The 10 month process proved more challenging than expected. "You think it would be easy to provide \$8 million of our cash and give it to the federal government for them to take it as part of what their responsibility is anyways," said Daniels. **The \$8 million will be credited toward a future channel deepening project. "Will give us credit toward future cost shares. So it's really a down payment. We're not just giving money to the federal government. We'll get it back at some point in the future," said Commissioner Jack Norris.** Board members say getting the channel deep enough is critical for future development. "It means that all the work we're doing down there, we'll be able to accommodate larger ships. It means the longshoremen that are working their today, as soon as that project is over, Dupont will bring in bigger ships that will create more man hours. That's what this whole project is about," said Board Chairman John Rester. In other business, the board approved a contract for the first major construction phase of Dupont's planned improvement project at the port.